DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 256 HE 003 584

TITLE	Collective Autonomy: Second Annual Review 1967/68.
INSTITUTION	Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, Toronto.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	71p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperative Planning; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *International Education; *Regional Planning; *Shared Services

ABSTRACT

This document presents a review of the activities of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario during the academic year 1967-68. During that academic year, great progress was made toward increased interinstitutional cooperation and coordination, specifically in the areas of graduate level planning, shared library resources, common admissions procedures, teacher education, computer facilities, and educational television. In addition, a funding formula for the universities in the system was devised and ways to improve student life through student participation in university governance, undergraduate and graduate student financial support, and improved student housing facilities were implemented. (HS)

ED 069256

Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario | Comité des Présidents d'Université de l'Ontario

COLLECTIVE AUTONOMY

Second Annual Review 1967/68

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE00 3584

4 Devonshire Place, Toronto 5

1968

PUBLISHED REPORTS OF
THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

(Available from the University of Toronto Bookroom)

Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962–1970
1962. $1.00

The Structure of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario
1963. $1.50

The City College, 1965. $1.00

University Television, 1965. $1.00

The Health Sciences in Ontario Universities:
Recent Experience and Prospects for the Next Decade
1966. $1.00

From the Sixties to the Seventies:
An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario
1966. $2.00

System Emerging:
First Annual Review (1966–67) of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario
1967. $1.00

Student Participation in University Government:
A study paper prepared for the Committee of Presidents by its Subcommittee on Research and Planning
1968. 50¢

Collective Autonomy: Second Annual Review, 1967–68
1968. $1.00

Printed at the University of Toronto Press, 1968

Foreword

System Emerging, the first Annual Review of the Committee of Presidents, described the beginnings of a university system in Ontario. The consolidation and development of the system that have taken place since the publication of the first Annual Review are reflected in the title of this, the second Annual Review, which is borrowed from the foundation oration "Hands off the Universities" delivered at Birkbeck College, University of London, by Sir Eric Ashby, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. The relevant portion of Sir Eric's address pointed out that

> . . . the universities themselves are now beginning to recognize that there is no security in the fragmented autonomy of four dozen independent corporations. What is needed is a collective autonomy of interdependent corporations, which retain freedom for diversity among themselves, but which present a common front on matters of vital importance. This is the only way in which the universities of Britain can continue to depend on Government funds and yet be strong enough to secure, by collective bargaining, the conditions necessary to fulfil their function in society.

It is greatly to the credit of the Government of Ontario that it has demonstrated a preference for the initiative in the field of university education to be taken by the universities themselves. Only if the universities appear unwilling or unable to confront the challenges facing them will there be a danger that the Government will step in and do the job. The account of developments in 1967–68 given in this Review is clear evidence that the universities have not hesitated to meet the challenges up to now. I am confident that we will not falter in doing so in the years that lie ahead.

A. D. Dunton
Chairman of the Committee

Ottawa, September 1968

Contents

FOREWORD iii

1. Survey '67-68 1

2. The Collectivity: Internal Organization and External Relations 6

3. The System in Action 11
   Cooperation and Planning at the Graduate Level, 11
   Sharing Library Resources, 14
   Assessing Library Needs, 16
   Common Admission Procedures, 18
   Opening the Door to the CAATs, 19
   Teacher Education, 21
   A Network of Computers, 23
   Television in the University, 26

4. The Formula Approach to Financing 28
   On Formula, 28
   A Path to Emergence, 31
   Implications of the Smith Report on Taxation, 34
   Capital Financing—The Short-Term Solution, 35
   The Search for a Capital Formula, 36
   Experimenting with a New System of Space Utilization, 38

5. Involving the Student 39
   Student Participation in University Government, 39
   Undergraduate Student Awards, 41
   Support for Graduate Students, 44
   Student Housing, 46

APPENDIX A Members, Observers, and Officers 51

APPENDIX B Constitution 52

APPENDIX C Subcommittees and Affiliates 55

APPENDIX D General Meeting of Discipline Groups, May 11, 1968: Opening Address by Dr. J. A. Corry 62

1. Survey '67-68

The universities of Ontario have completed another year of progress towards the establishment of a voluntary university system, based in part on the recommendations of the Spinks Report.[1] The question has been asked, and must seriously be debated by all concerned with higher education in Ontario, whether a voluntary system is viable at all. Thomas R. McConnell pointed out in his Frank Gerstein lecture at York University in 1966 that evidence in the United States "indicates clearly that purely voluntary methods of coordination are no longer effective, and voluntary agencies are being superseded by those with statutory status and authority."[2] This pessimistic view is grounded in the commonplace that people will cooperate cheerfully when each stands to gain something from it but that, if they are required to give up something, cooperation breaks down. It will be of interest to look at the major cooperative ventures undertaken by the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, the story of which is told at greater length in the succeeding chapters of this Review, and try to assess the degree to which they provide evidence for and against the pessimistic view.

The interuniversity library transit system, which has just completed its first year of operation, has greatly reduced the time taken in inter-library loan and has facilitated a sharp increase in book traffic among libraries. The system entails some increase in cost for the universities but its benefits have been so apparent as to outweigh decisively any financial sacrifice involved. The cooperative-use agreement, also a year old, gives faculty and graduate students reader privileges at any Ontario university; the extra burden undertaken by each library in accommodating visiting scholars has not given rise to complaints. The

[1] *Report of the Commission to Study the Development of Graduate Programmes in Ontario Universities* (Toronto: Ontario Department of University Affairs, 1966).

[2] Thomas R. McConnell, "Governments and the University—A Comparative Analysis," *Governments and the University* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1966), p. 83.

third cooperative library venture, the bibliographic centre project, is now in the planning stage and has not yet produced either benefits or burdens to a sufficient degree to enable it to serve as evidence in this assessment.

Exchange of information on television teaching and systematic study of the role of television in the university have been helped by the establishment a year ago of the central office of the Ontario Universities' Television Council. The cost of this operation has so far been modest and is outweighed by the benefits.

The common admission procedure, put into effect for the first time for fall admission to university in 1968, has been a distinct improvement over the previous practice whereby each university handled its own admissions in isolation. The admission procedure is a clear instance of gain for everyone and loss for no one, and therefore cannot be used to gainsay the pessimists.

The appraisals procedure, inaugurated at the beginning of 1967, enables universities to submit proposed programmes of graduate study to independent evaluation and assessment. Generally, the universities welcomed the opportunity to have their graduate programmes appraised, but the appraisals procedure has its critics. During the year, the by-law of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies governing appraisals was amended to allow the Council's Appraisals Committee to recommend granting approval for a programme to commence at a specified future date in cases where the required criteria cannot be met immediately. Even with this modification there is bound to be some disappointment on the part of university departments which must postpone their desire to offer new programmes of graduate study. The appraisals procedure does appear to require some sacrifice on the part of the cooperating institutions.

On May 11, 1968, the Committee of Presidents convened a meeting of representatives of discipline groups from all Ontario universities to explore ways in which interuniversity cooperation in graduate studies might be achieved. The long-range objective, towards which the May 11 meeting was a first step, is the avoidance of unnecessary duplication in graduate studies needed if the universities are to make optimum use of their scarce resources in this very expensive area. As Dr. J. A. Corry, then Chairman of the Committee of Presidents, suggested in his opening address at the meeting, this may well be the most important business the universities of Ontario have yet attempted together. He warned that the process of cooperation would not be a painless one and said that all the universities would have to pass self-

denying ordinances and curb their aspirations in some directions. Clearly, the pessimistic assertion that voluntary cooperation which involves sacrifices is impossible will be disproved in Ontario if the promising beginning in 1967–68 of the process of cooperation in graduate studies is translated into effective action in the years ahead.

One factor that has an important bearing on the viability of the university system is the role being played by the Government of Ontario. Although the Government has a declared interest in the shape of higher education in the province, it has repeatedly expressed a preference for a voluntary system in which the initiative flows from the universities themselves. For example, the Minister of University Affairs in his Frank Gerstein lecture at York University in 1966 said: "There is, moreover, much evidence to indicate that provided the universities can meet the responsibilities of our times we should undoubtedly be better off if they were allowed to continue to operate with . . . autonomy."[3]

But the Government has also made it clear that it stands ready to do the job if the universities falter, as witness these words of the Minister which follow immediately after the quotation in the preceding paragraph:

> On the other hand, if they cannot or will not accept those responsibilities, and if, for example, large numbers of able students must be turned away because the university is not prepared to accept them, or if, as another example, some of the less glamorous disciplines are ignored, despite pressing demands for graduates in those areas, or if costly duplication of effort is evident, I cannot imagine that any society, especially one bearing large expense for higher education, will want to stand idly by. For there will inevitably be a demand—there have been indications of this in other jurisdictions—that government move in and take over.[4]

Nor has the Government's willingness to play an active role in guiding university affairs been confined entirely to declarations of intent. Two events that took place in 1967–68 will illustrate this. The appraisals procedure for graduate programmes was launched by the universities and each institution was left free to decide whether or not to submit its graduate programmes to appraisal. However, the Government has decided that, for purposes of the calculation of formula grants, with respect to new graduate programmes only those students registered in programmes which have met the requirements of the appraisal procedure will be counted. Secondly, the universities recommended to the

[3]William G. Davis, "The Government of Ontario and the Universities of the Province," *Governments and the University* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1966), p. 34.
[4]*Loc. cit.*

Government that it should support regional computer centres based on computer installations at certain universities and under the control of the universities; however, the Government decided that the regional centres should be a kind of public utility independent of the universities.

It seems then that, while the university system in Ontario is essentially a voluntary one, the position is influenced by the unique interaction of the system with the public bodies concerned with higher education—the Minister and Department of University Affairs and the advisory Committee on University Affairs. As the system develops, the question must be asked whether the existing structures, public and private, are appropriate to the needs of higher education in Ontario. On the one hand, the structure of the voluntary system must be kept under review to ensure that it is equal to the tasks imposed by collective autonomy. On the other, the public bodies must be structured in such a way as to facilitate cooperation with the voluntary system. The Committee of Presidents noted with satisfaction that of four new members appointed to the Committee on University Affairs during the year, three were academics.

The questions discussed in this chapter would properly have fallen within the province of the proposed Commission to Study Post-Secondary Education, establishment of which was recommended to the Minister of University Affairs in mid-1966. The Minister accepted the recommendation and announced the Commission's terms of reference in the Ontario Legislature on June 5, 1967. Unfortunately, it proved difficult to find persons of the appropriate calibre to serve on the Commission and in September 1968 the Committee of Presidents decided to withdraw its recommendation that the Commission be set up, and to propose alternative methods for the systematic study of post-secondary education in Ontario. The Presidents have offered their services to the Minister to help initiate the necessary studies and to participate in carrying them forward.

A major factor contributing to the Presidents' decision not to pursue the question of an Ontario study commission was the establishment by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Association of University Teachers in the summer of 1968 of a national Commission on the Relations between Universities and Governments. This Commission's terms of reference require it to consider the distinctive role of universities in the changing Canadian society, particularly with respect to their responsibilities for the development of this role at the various levels of society; to determine

the need, nature and extent of university autonomy and government and public control of universities; and to recommend appropriate instruments for relations between universities and governments. The Commission expects to report in mid-1969. Since the national Commission will study a number of matters on which the proposed Ontario Commission would have been expected to comment, the Committee of Presidents has decided to present to the former a brief setting forth the Ontario experience and the policies which in its judgment can best contribute to sound planning and to fruitful relations between universities and government. The Presidents are hopeful that their brief will serve as a point of departure for further evolution of the university system in Ontario which will reflect enlightened public policy and the objective of strong and diversified universities.

2. The Collectivity: Internal Organization and External Relations

The end of the year under review brought to a close the two-year term of office of members of the Executive of the Committee of Presidents. Dr. J. A. Corry retired not only from the chairmanship of the Committee but also from the post of Principal of Queen's University. Elected to succeed Dr. Corry for the ensuing two-year period was Dr. A. Davidson Dunton, President of Carleton University. Very Reverend Dr. Roger Guindon, Rector of the Université d'Ottawa, was re-elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee of Presidents for a further term and Dr. H. G. Thode, President of McMaster University, was re-elected to the Executive. Two members retired from the Executive —Mr. J. H. Sword, Acting President of the University of Toronto, and Dr. J. A. Gibson, President of Brock University—to be succeeded by Dr. D. C. Williams, President of the University of Western Ontario, and Mr. S. G. Mullins, President of Laurentian University. A list of members of the Committee of Presidents is given at Appendix A to this Review.

Dr. Edward F. Sheffield, who had organized the secretariat in 1966, relinquished the post of Executive Vice-Chairman at the end of June 1968 to devote himself full-time to his duties as Professor of Higher Education in the University of Toronto. Dr. Sheffield had rendered outstanding service and it was with great regret that the Committee saw him go. The post of Executive Vice-Chairman was offered to Dr. John B. Macdonald, former President of the University of British Columbia and latterly consultant to the Science Council and the Canada Council on support of research in Canadian universities. Dr. Macdonald assumed duty in September 1968. J. A. d'Oliveira, who joined the secretariat in July 1967 as Assistant to the Executive Vice-Chairman, was re-designated Secretary effective July 1, 1968, and was in charge of the office during the interval between Dr. Sheffield's departure and Dr. Macdonald's assumption of duty. The steady in-

crease in the activities of the Committee of Presidents necessitated the addition of another officer in the secretariat and effective August 1, 1968, Paul Haefling was appointed Assistant Secretary. Officers of the secretariat are listed at Appendix A.

During the year the Constitution of the Committee of Presidents, originally adopted in December 1966, was amended twice. The first group of amendments, relating to the sections on subcommittees and affiliates, was designed to codify existing practice and in some cases to simplify procedures which had proved too cumbersome. It was decided to seek registration of the Committee of Presidents as a charitable organization under the Income Tax Act to enable it to receive tax-deductible gifts and a new section, Dissolution, was added to the Constitution to comply with the requirements of the Department of National Revenue. The Department requires charitable organizations to have a clause in their constitutions to the effect that upon dissolution all the assets and property of the organization shall, after payment of its just debts and obligations, be distributed to one or more charitable organizations in Canada. Registration of the Committee as a charitable organization was granted with effect from January 1, 1967, and the Committee is authorized to receive tax-deductible gifts from that date. The Constitution as amended is reproduced at Appendix B to this Review.

The Committee of Presidents continues to depend heavily on its network of subcommittees and affiliates made up of members of the university community who serve voluntarily in a part-time capacity. During the year one new standing subcommittee was formed—the Subcommittee on Student Housing. At its own request, the Subcommittee on the Financing of Emergent Universities was discharged with appreciation. Its functions have fallen to the Subcommittee on Operating Grants, formerly the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae, now with expanded terms of reference and membership. Two special subcommittees were established to assess Ontario university library requirements, one dealing with undergraduate collections and the other with collections for graduate studies and research. In addition, the Ontario University Registrars' Association and the Ontario Committee of Deans and Directors of Library Schools were affiliated to the Committee of Presidents. A list of subcommittees and affiliates with a summary of their tasks and membership patterns is given in Appendix C.

The emergence of a university system in Ontario owes a great deal to the dedicated academics and administrators in the universities who

in addition to carrying a full load in their regular posts have been willing to devote much time and effort to voluntary service on the subcommittees and affiliates of the Committee of Presidents. As the system expands it may be wondered how much longer it will be possible to ask groups manned only by voluntary part-time members to carry the burden imposed by the development of the collective approach. There has already been some recognition of the need for paid assistance. At the beginning of the period under review, the Ontario Universities' Television Council set up its own small secretariat to enable the Council to perform its functions effectively. The interuniversity library transit system is operated by a manager and staff reporting to the Ontario Council of University Librarians. The Council of Librarians has also engaged a full-time consultant for its bibliographic centre project; he will advise generally on a systems approach to library development. From July 1968 the Subcommittee on Computer Services has been authorized to engage the services of a part-time administrative assistant. It seems clear that one of the major items on the agenda for the current academic year must be a careful review of the structure and functions of the Committee of Presidents, its subcommittees and affiliates, and its secretariat.

In October 1967 Waterloo Lutheran University requested the Committee of Presidents to admit it to some type of relationship that would permit participation by that University in the work of the Committee. Since Waterloo Lutheran University is technically not a provincially assisted university it could not under the terms of the Constitution of the Committee of Presidents be admitted to full membership. However, since it was clear that Waterloo Lutheran was interested in and affected by many of the activities of the Committee of Presidents, it was agreed in December 1967 that the President of that University should be admitted to observer status. At the same time observer status was extended to the Commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston. Observers and their academic colleagues are present at most parts of most meetings of the Committee of Presidents and the observers receive copies of full minutes of meetings of the Committee. Representatives of the two institutions whose heads enjoy observer status are also invited on appropriate occasions to attend as observers meetings of the subcommittees and affiliates of the Committee of Presidents. The observers are listed at Appendix A.

During the year new lines of communications were opened up between the Committee of Presidents and other elements within the university community. Communication with the academic legislative

bodies in the universities has been improved by the practice, begun in September 1967, of presidents' bringing academic colleagues with them to all regular meetings of the Committee of Presidents. In most cases the academic colleague is chosen by the senate or other academic body in the university, and he reports back to such body on matters discussed at meetings of the Committee. This practice has also been a valuable means of broadening the Committee's deliberations. There was further contact between the presidents and the faculty when the Committee of Presidents and the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations held an interesting and stimulating two-day joint meeting in Toronto on June 20–21, 1968. Chairmen of university boards of governors were invited to a meeting of the Committee of Presidents in November 1967. The Presidents' Executive met with the Executive of the Ontario Union of Students in May 1968.

Close contact with the public bodies in Ontario concerned with university affairs continued during 1967–68. The Committee of Presidents met twice during the year with the Minister of University Affairs, and groups of presidents concerned with specific questions met with the Minister on other occasions. Three meetings were held with the Committee on University Affairs—two to consider the value of the basic income unit for 1968–69 under the operating grants formula, and the third to discuss universities' requests for capital funds for library development. When Dr. D. T. Wright was appointed the first full-time Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs early in 1967, the practice was begun of inviting him to be present during part of each regular meeting of the Committee of Presidents. Beginning with the September 1967 meeting, Dr. Wright had been invited to bring another member of his Committee with him. The joint committee of three persons named by the Committee on University Affairs and three appointed by the Committee of Presidents which developed the operating grants formula in 1966 has provided a useful model. Similarly constituted are the Capital Studies Committee, set up in June 1967 to guide studies expected to lead to a formula for capital grants, and the Committee on Computer Services, appointed a year later to plan the development of regional computer centres. Informal contact between subgroups of the Committee of Presidents and members of the Committee on University Affairs is frequent.

The Committee of Presidents is studying ways of establishing communication with other post-secondary institutions in Ontario and will probably seek opportunities to meet with the recently formed Committee of Presidents of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

Liaison with other universities in Canada is maintained through the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and through participation by Ontario universities in studies and research projects sponsored by that Association and by other Canada-wide bodies, notably the Canadian Association of University Teachers. The secretariat of the Committee of Presidents is in touch with inter-university organizations in other Canadian provinces, and with academic consortia in the United States through *The Acquainter*, a newsletter on the activities of such bodies compiled by Lewis D. Patterson, Director of Program Development of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education.

The Ontario public is kept informed of the activities of the Committee of Presidents through the news media of the province. Three news conferences were held during 1967–68: one to launch the first Annual Review, the second to explain the common admission procedures, and the third to report on the meeting of discipline groups held May 11, 1968. Other developments of note were communicated in news releases, most of which were issued in French as well as in English. The news media gave prominent coverage to some of the material publicized, especially the study paper *Student Participation in University Government*, and the announcement of guidelines for admission to university of graduates of other post-secondary institutions.

3. The System in Action

COOPERATION AND PLANNING AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

Progress was made during the year towards attainment of the objective of a rational distribution of well-planned graduate programmes in Ontario universities and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication from one university to another. As proposed by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies arising out of the recommendations of the Spinks Report, and endorsed by the Committee of Presidents, the means towards the objective are two-fold: an appraisals procedure for programmes of graduate study, and interinstitutional consultation within individual disciplines with a view to working out a division of responsibility among the universities for particular aspects of graduate study and research.

The appraisals procedure was established by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies at the beginning of 1967. Under it a university wishing to have a proposed graduate programme appraised will submit it to the Council before submitting it to its own senate for final approval. The procedure is available for any discipline at any university, for Ph.D. and master's programmes, and for existing as well as proposed programmes, though priority will be given to new programmes and existing ones will be appraised only selectively. Appraisals are carried out by outside consultants acceptable both to the university and to the Council on Graduate Studies and consist essentially in an assessment by the consultants of a university's ability to sustain a graduate programme in a particular field in accordance with certain agreed academic criteria. Under the procedure as initially adopted, failure to measure up to the academic criteria would result in an unfavourable appraisal. However, it was suggested to the Council on Graduate Studies that it might be useful for a university to have a proposed graduate programme appraised even if it was not certain that the criteria would be met so that the university might receive

guidance on the steps it should take to meet the requirements at a future date. Accordingly, the Council on Graduate Studies in May 1968 approved an amendment to its by-law governing appraisals to provide that its Appraisals Committee might recommend granting approval for a programme to commence at a specified future date, the postponement to be for not more than two full academic years, subject to confirmation by the Appraisals Committee prior to that date that the department wishing to offer the programme had matured in the interim. This modification of the procedure should encourage universities to avail themselves of the benefits of independent evaluation of their graduate programmes without risking unduly the disappointment of an unfavourable appraisal.

While, as has been said, appraisals are based solely on academic criteria and the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies does not consider itself or its Appraisals Committee as in any sense a resource-planning agency, the Government decided during the year to use the results of appraisals in determining its own grants policy. The Government has decided that, for purposes of the calculation of formula grants, with respect to new graduate programmes only those students registered in programmes which have met the requirements of the appraisal procedure will be counted. This policy affects Ph.D. programmes established after January 1, 1967, and master's programmes established after July 1, 1967.

Appraisal of graduate programmes will ensure that those programmes that are launched are well planned and will be supported with adequate resources, but it will do little to eliminate duplication in graduate offerings by the universities. Undesirable duplication will be eliminated where it exists or avoided before it occurs only if there is cooperation among the universities and a division of responsibility for various aspects of graduate work. The first decisive step towards the aim of cooperation was taken on May 11, 1968, when a general meeting of some 450 representatives of discipline groups from all universities in Ontario was held in Toronto. At a plenary session in the morning the meeting was addressed by Dr. J. A. Corry, then Chairman of the Committee of Presidents, who stressed the need for interuniversity cooperation at the graduate level if the universities were to make optimum use of their scarce resources in the expensive area of graduate studies. The text of Dr. Corry's address is attached as Appendix D to this Review. After Dr. Corry's address the theme of cooperation was taken up by two academics, one representing the humanities and social sciences, and the other the natural sciences. In

the afternoon the meeting broke up into separate discipline groups, each of which was invited to organize itself if it had not already done so, to elect officers and to arrange for follow-up meetings on a continuing basis. The groups were asked to send minutes of the afternoon meetings to the secretariat. Many of the discipline groups have submitted reports which are being studied by an Advisory Committee on Academic Planning recently established by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

In recommending to the Committee of Presidents that a general meeting of discipline groups be held, the Council on Graduate Studies had made certain suggestions on ways in which cooperation might be achieved. The Presidents endorsed the suggestions and these were put before the general meeting in the course of Dr. Corry's opening address. The first suggestion was that each discipline group should be invited to prepare a brief outlining the special character of the discipline, indicating the necessary core areas and the optional areas of specialization within it, summarized in an inventory showing graduate programmes in being, those that had been approved and budgeted for, and programmes in the planning stage which had not yet been approved. Secondly, the Council on Graduate Studies had suggested that the reaction of the disciplines should be sought to the possibility of organizing summer institutes in a region. The third suggestion was that the discipline groups might discuss the feasibility of opening a limited number of graduate courses in one university in a region to graduate students registered in another nearby institution. As a fourth suggestion the disciplines were invited to discover any undeveloped areas of graduate studies and research which ought to be taken up in the province.

At the plenary session on May 11 the general tone of remarks from the floor following the opening speeches was favourable to the idea of interinstitutional cooperation by discipline. The general reaction since that time has also been favourable. However, both at the meeting and subsequently some apprehension was expressed about the role of the smaller universities in graduate work. The presidents had been notified in March that the Committee on University Affairs had recommended that graduate work in emergent universities should be confined in the period of emergence to master's programmes in specified areas which had been approved under the appraisal procedure, and that emergent institutions and established universities should be encouraged to work together in the development of consortia which would allow effective participation in graduate studies for all institutions. Representatives

of the newer universities no doubt tended to see in the Presidents' call for cooperation an echo of the wishes of the Committee on University Affairs. However, while the Committee of Presidents is in favour of sharing and cooperation at the graduate level, it has not endorsed the idea that emergent universities should be confined exclusively to master's programmes.

SHARING LIBRARY RESOURCES

The universities' commitment to cooperation is perhaps best exemplified by the arrangements they have made or are planning for sharing library resources. The interuniversity library transit system is now completing its first year of operation, as are arrangements for visiting scholars from any one university in Ontario to use the facilities of the library of any other university within the system. Planning is under way for the establishment of a bibliographic centre aimed at correlating and systematizing the holdings and acquisitions of the university libraries in Ontario.

With headquarters at York University, the interuniversity library transit system was launched in September 1967 in an effort to reduce the average interval between request and delivery date of materials requested on interlibrary loan from eight days to twenty-four hours. Experience to date shows that this objective has been realized. Latest available statistics show that interlibrary loan volume among Ontario universities has doubled since the inauguration of the transit system. A fleet of five station-wagons visits twelve of the fourteen universities within the system each day, collecting and delivering library materials. The two northern universities, Lakehead and Laurentian, are not visited by the station-wagons; they were served initially by air freight but, in an effort to speed up exchange of materials with them, air express was later substituted for air freight. In addition to greatly speeding up the exchange of material, the transit system saves in staff time taken to process requests, wrap parcels, type labels and deliver parcels to campus postal centres. The cost of operating the system, which is estimated at $75,000 in a full year, will be offset in part by savings on postage and handling costs. The system also has the advantage of minimizing wear and tear on books and the risk of damage to valuable documents. Designed primarily for the transportation of library materials, the transit system has also begun carrying passengers between university libraries. The Ontario Council of University Librarians, on whose initiative the transit system was launched

and which is responsible for its management, is preparing a report on its first year of operation. This report will be published by the Committee of Presidents.

The library cooperative-use agreement, which came into effect about the same time as the transit system, gives faculty and graduate students in Ontario universities access to university library resources across the province. Under the scheme a faculty member or graduate student may on request obtain an introduction card enabling him to visit any of the cooperating libraries and obtain most of the services available to the faculty or graduate students of the university he visits. Visiting privileges include use of normal library facilities and reference service and photocopying; it does not include the borrowing of library materials, which is handled under the arrangements for the transit system. Based on a decision of the Committee of Presidents, on the recommendation of the Ontario Council of University Librarians, that the development of undergraduate library resources and services is a basic responsibility of each university, undergraduates are not included in the cooperative-use scheme. Some 350 introduction cards have been issued to faculty and graduate students at Ontario universities, entitling them to visiting privileges at university libraries other than their own.

The Committee of Presidents accepted an offer of the University of Toronto to make space available in that University's new Humanities and Social Science Research Library to house a central facility serving the whole Ontario university library system. Located within the central facility will be a bibliographic centre comprising an up-to-date registry in machine-readable form of all catalogue data obtained from Ontario universities and other sources, which will be made quickly available on request to any library within the system. In the fall of 1967, the Ontario Council of University Librarians, after studying the implications of the Spinks Report, decided that, in order to proceed rapidly with the development of the bibliographic centre, a consultant experienced in the analysis and design of library information systems should be engaged without delay. On the recommendation of the Council of Librarians, the Committee of Presidents agreed that H. Duncan Wall should be engaged as a consultant for one year from January 1, 1968, to investigate all aspects of cooperation among Ontario university libraries which would impinge on the organization, management, cost and operation of the bibliographic centre. Mr. Wall's terms of reference require him to study the feasibility of coordination and centralization of technical processes; library automation;

the cooperative use of collections; the practicability of centralized storage of less-used library materials; the feasibility of developing library profiles for the universities of the province and relating these to the projected bibliographic centre.

By mid-April the consultant had completed his initial orientation and programme planning. He then began an examination of existing library systems and in June submitted a progress report which translated his terms of reference into a sequence of specific tasks and a programme plan for the academic year 1968–69. Mr. Wall expects to submit a draft report on development guidelines for the bibliographic centre shortly.

The Committee on University Affairs would like to see the universities move even more swiftly towards a system approach to library development. That Committee invited the Committee of Presidents to a meeting on July 2, 1968, to discuss requests from a number of universities for capital funds for library facilities. Following that meeting, the Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs wrote to the presidents of all the universities individually asking them to reaffirm their commitment to the system approach. Many of the presidents replied individually and the Chairman of the Committee of Presidents also sent a reply on behalf of the Committee as a whole reaffirming its commitment to the system approach to library development.

ASSESSING LIBRARY NEEDS

No one doubts that the library collections of many Ontario universities are deficient at both the undergraduate and the graduate and research levels. Various attempts have been made to determine the extent of the deficiencies but none has proved altogether satisfactory. One method that has been applied is the Clapp-Jordan formula[1] but its usefulness in the Ontario context is limited because it is an averaging formula and does not provide properly for the differing requirements in library resources of the various disciplines, particularly as between the humanities and social sciences on the one hand and the natural sciences on the other. In addition, when applied at the graduate level, the Clapp-Jordan formula would produce duplications of collections which would not accord with the objective that Ontario

[1]Verner W. Clapp, and Robert T. Jordan. *Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections*, College and Research Libraries, Part XXVI, p. 374, September 1965.

universities have set themselves of dividing responsibility for graduate studies and research.

To make the most persuasive case possible for library needs, the Committee of Presidents decided that it was important to find ways of measuring these needs that would command wider agreement than the methods previously devised. Accordingly, in February 1968 the Committee set up a Special Subcommittee on Assessment of Library Requirements with the responsibility of seeking to determine standards by which to assess the needs and deficiencies of the libraries of provincially assisted universities in Ontario, with special reference to undergraduate collections. The Chairman is Mr. W. B. Ready, Librarian at McMaster University, and there are two other librarians on the Subcommittee, one representing one of the smaller universities and one with a knowledge of French library requirements. There are also three academics, one from the humanities, one from the social sciences, and one from the natural sciences. The Special Subcommittee began its work almost immediately and after opening up promising lines of inquiry met with Dr. D. T. Wright, Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs.

It was intended that the Subcommittee set up in February should concern itself largely with undergraduate library collections but it was given the option of extending its inquiry to collections for graduate programmes at the master's level. However, in July, the Advisory Joint Council on Coordination of Ontario University Library Research Facilities recommended that a separate subcommittee should be set up to study library needs at the graduate and research level. This recommendation was accepted and the Special Subcommittee on Assessment of Graduate and Research Library Requirements was set up to establish a method of assessing the extent to which Ontario university libraries are adequate to support programmes of graduate study and research, including faculty research where there is no graduate programme, and a method of estimating all related costs. As methods are developed and approved, the Special Subcommittee is also authorized to proceed to their application. The Subcommittee will take into account, within the context of the Ontario universities' research library system, the long-term effects on library needs of existing and future cooperation, discipline by discipline, among the various universities. The Chairman of the Special Subcommittee is Dr. R. H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian of the University of Toronto. The membership includes four other librarians and five academics, two of whom

are graduate deans, representing the humanities, the social sciences and the natural sciences. The Subcommittee held its first meeting in September.

COMMON ADMISSION PROCEDURES

The common admission procedures involving the use of a common general application form, proposed by the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions and approved by the Committee of Presidents and ratified by each of the universities during 1967, went into effect for the first time in the spring and summer of 1968 for fall admission to university this year. In December 1967 a minor amendment to the procedures described in *System Emerging*[2] was approved by the Committee of Presidents on the recommendation of the Council on Admissions and later ratified by each of the participating universities.

Under the common procedures for 1968–69, the applicant for admission lists in order of preference on the common general application form all the universities to which he wants to apply; the universities could make formal offers of early final or provisional admission not earlier than May 15 and the earliest date on which a university could require a candidate to accept an offer of admission was June 15. Each university receiving formal acceptance agreed to notify each other university listed on the common application form of the student's response. The procedures originally adopted stated that "none of the other universities will consider the applicant unless and until the university receiving a student's formal acceptance issues a release"; the amendment referred to above deleted the phrase quoted and had the effect of allowing any university that had not rendered a final decision on an application on the basis of interim marks to announce its decision as a matter of course when final marks were available, whether or not the candidate had meanwhile accepted an offer from another university.

The Council on Admissions proposed another modification of the admission procedures which was also adopted by the Committee of Presidents and ratified by the various universities. This recommendation was that the awarding of scholarships, and requests for acceptance of these scholarships by students, should follow the same two dates, namely May 15 and June 15, as the granting of early final

[2]*System Emerging: First Annual Review (1966–67) of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario* (Toronto, 1966), pp. 18–20.

admission to students. This did not preclude scholarships not awarded by those two dates from being awarded later but it had the effect of ensuring that no earlier offers or demands on applicants for acceptance of offers might be made.

Response on the part of applicants and the high schools to the common admission procedures and the use of the common general application form has been favourable. Experience with the use of the form pointed up the need to make a number of minor technical revisions. For admission in the fall of 1969 a revised form will be used, designed to make it easy to fill out the form on a typewriter and to facilitate the transfer of the information on the form to punched cards. Experience also showed that the date originally set for the making of offers of admission, May 15, was too early to allow the secondary schools to make a fully valid assessment of the student's potential and, as well, did not permit the universities to take advantage of the results of the standardized achievement tests administered by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in cooperation with the Service for Admission to College and University. The Council on Admissions has therefore decided to recommend that for admission in the fall of 1969 the earliest date on which offers of admission may be mailed by universities should be May 30.

OPENING THE DOOR TO THE CAATs

The universities of Ontario are generally in agreement with the policy of the Government that the new colleges of applied arts and technology should afford a distinctive type of post-secondary education and should not attempt to duplicate the programmes of the universities or to provide courses specifically intended to prepare candidates for admission to university. Nonetheless, it was intended from the beginning that entry to university should be open to individual students whose performance in the new colleges demonstrated a capacity for university work. Universities have for some years been accepting students on transfer from the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and for the most part the performance at university of such transfer students has been of high quality. At the end of 1966 the Committee of Presidents asked the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions to study the question of transfer from the new colleges and to recommend guidelines that might be adopted by the universities, within the framework of which each university could devise its

own policy on admission of students from other post-secondary institutions.

A year later, draft guidelines proposed by the Council on Admissions were accepted by the Committee of Presidents and circulated for the comments of the senates of the various universities. After studying the comments of university senates, the Committee of Presidents in May 1968 issued a public statement on admission to university of students from colleges of applied arts and technology and other non-university institutions of post-secondary education.

The statement said that it was clear that universities in the province were prepared to consider outstanding graduates of other post-secondary institutions for admission. It stated that universities were in general prepared to consider for admission to appropriate second-year university programmes students who achieved high standing in a three-year programme of the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute or a college of applied arts and technology. Some universities would expect "first-class standing" from students to be considered; others would expect "high standing." Some would base their consideration on the standing of a student in the final year of his three-year programme; others on standing throughout the programme. In the same way, the statement continued, the universities would consider for admission to an appropriate first-year university programme students who had achieved first-class, or in some cases high, standing in two years of non-university post-secondary education. The statement was intended as a guideline only and as a general indication of the policies that would be followed by the individual universities in regard to admission of students from other post-secondary institutions. Information regarding the policies of individual universities would therefore have to be obtained from the universities themselves.

Public reaction to the Presidents' statement was markedly favourable, especially among those who had been apprehensive that the colleges of applied arts and technology might become "dead-end" institutions. Surprisingly, the press tended to regard the announcement as an abrupt reversal of policy on the part of the universities whereas in fact it was an attempt to put on a more formal and systematic basis practices that had been in effect for some time. Colleges of applied arts and technology are a new development in Ontario and it is possible that after there has been some further experience with their graduates the universities may again review their policies with respect to transfer from such institutions.

TEACHER EDUCATION

Significant steps were taken during the year under review towards implementation of the recommendations of the MacLeod Committee[3] that the one-year course of teacher education after Grade 13 for those wishing to qualify as elementary-school teachers should be replaced by a full university course, including professional training, either concurrently with work leading to a bachelor's degree, or in a final year after the B.A.

In September 1967 the Presidents' Subcommittee on Teacher Education held a meeting to which were invited the Deputy Minister of Education, the Director of the Teacher Education Branch of the Department of Education, and the Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs. The purpose of the meeting was to explore the common principles that should underlie and inform every agreement for the integration of a programme of teacher education into a university. At the meeting the Subcommittee decided to set up a drafting committee to prepare a statement of the essential conditions under which the universities would be prepared to assume responsibility for teacher-education programmes. The drafting committee was asked to give particular attention to methods of financing the teacher education facility once it had been transferred to a university, to procedures for the appointment of staff, the prescription of curricula, and standards of admission of students.

The statement prepared by the drafting committee was circulated to members of the Committee of Presidents in January 1968 and was later revised in the light of comments received from the various universities. The revised statement was endorsed by the Committee of Presidents at the beginning of March, and copies were sent to the Minister of Education and to officials of the departments of Education and of University Affairs. Discussions between members of the Subcommittee on Teacher Education and interested officials were held in April and again in June, and broad agreement was reached on the principles by which both the Government and the universities will be guided in discussions leading to the working out of individual agreements for the integration of teacher-education programmes into universities. Formal assent has not yet been given either by the Government or by the Committee of Presidents to the guidelines

[3]*Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers* (Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1966).

proposed. However, it is likely that the statement of principles that will be adopted will contain the features outlined in the following paragraphs.

Capital funds to cover the cost of buildings and facilities needed for programmes of teacher education offered by universities will be provided in full by the Government of Ontario. Buildings will be the property of the university concerned while an agreement is in force; if an agreement is terminated provision will be made for the university to retain or assume ownership of the building. Financial responsibility for operating costs will eventually be transferred from the Department of Education to the Department of University Affairs, and consideration will be given to bringing grants for the operation of teacher-education facilities under a formula system.

An advisory committee, comprising persons named in part by the senate of the university and in part by the Minister of Education, will advise the president of the university on matters pertaining to the teacher-education function, for instance, staffing policy and curriculum. The advisory committee will not supplant the authority of the appropriate governing bodies of the university, and the teacher-education unit will be subject to the same academic and administrative procedures as other faculties and departments of the university.

Certification of teachers will remain the responsibility of the Minister of Education, who may prescribe the conditions requisite for certification. The university will be free to admit to the teacher-education programme any applicant who satisfies the admission requirements set by the university. Students in the teacher-education programme will be assessed the same fees as students in other comparable programmes in the university, and will be eligible for financial assistance on the same basis as other students.

Subject to the Minister's responsibility for prescribing conditions requisite for certification, the university will be free to develop its own programmes for teacher education, which may be in accord with either the concurrent or the consecutive plan. Each university will be free to accredit its own courses in teacher education, both at the elementary and the secondary level, and to grant degrees or diplomas in recognition of satisfactory fulfilment of the requirements of the university. Research in education will be encouraged and graduate studies may be provided where justified. The need for programmes of special education is to be carefully explored.

Where possible, the academic head of the teacher-education unit in a university, the dean of the faculty or the chairman of the department

as the case may be, will be appointed in advance of the launching of the teacher-education programme. He will be appointed after consultation between the Minister and the appropriate persons within the university. During a transitional period after the transfer of responsibility for teacher education from a teachers' college to a university, which might be envisaged as lasting three years, special arrangements will be in effect with regard to staff transferred to the university from a teachers' college. Such staff members will be encouraged to take study leave to improve their academic qualifications, and it is hoped that financial support will be provided for this purpose. The universities and the Department of Education are expected to undertake to discover alternative openings for members of the staff of a teachers' college who for one reason or another do not join the university staff. The procedures for new appointments will conform to those in effect at the university concerned.

If the guidelines are formally adopted by the Government and by the Committee of Presidents, it will be open to any university to enter into negotiation leading to an agreement to establish a programme of teacher education. It is probable that the first programmes for the education of elementary-school teachers to be offered by Ontario universities will be in effect by the fall of 1969.

The Subcommittee on Teacher Education has so far concerned itself largely with questions relating to the education of elementary-school teachers. The Subcommittee has been invited to consider whether in future its scope should encompass also the education of secondary-school teachers, and whether any broadening of its terms of reference and membership would be needed to enable it to take on this additional responsibility.

A NETWORK OF COMPUTERS

Intensive activity during the year by the Presidents' Subcommittee on Computer Services culminated in a joint announcement on July 8, 1968, by the Minister of University Affairs and the Chairman of the Committee of Presidents of a cooperative policy of developing regional computer centres to serve all the provincially assisted universities in the province.

The Subcommittee on Computer Services was set up in June 1967 to study and make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents on problems related to the development, coordination and financing of university computer services in Ontario. In September of that year

it presented a preliminary report to the Committee of Presidents which envisaged computer facilities for each university to look after local needs, and the establishment of a network of regional centres for research calculation and for large computer jobs. It was suggested that the regional centres could also serve the needs of other publicly supported institutions, for example colleges of applied arts and technology, and hospitals. The Committee of Presidents endorsed the approach suggested by the Subcommittee and asked the Subcommittee to develop detailed proposals. In December, the Subcommittee presented a further report proposing that capital grants for computer equipment should be replaced by annual grants calculated on the basis of a specified sum per basic income unit, with a minimum of $100,000 to any one university, except that a university to which future capital commitments for computers had been made would continue to receive the amount committed if this was larger than the annual grant. The Subcommittee also proposed that additional funds should be made available by the Government of Ontario for regional computer systems. These proposals were accepted by the Committee of Presidents and their substance was conveyed to the Committee on University Affairs. Shortly after, the Subcommittee reported that six universities had indicated that they were ready to begin working towards regional systems for 1968–69.

In March 1968, the Committee on University Affairs intimated that it found the proposals of the Subcommittee on Computer Services very attractive but said that it was unlikely that the full system proposed could be financed in the next fiscal year. The Committee on University Affairs had therefore decided to engage the services of consultants so as to obtain independent advice to assist it in making recommendations for 1968–69. Later that month it was announced that a total of $4.5 million would be made available for the support of University computer services in 1968–69, including the amounts needed for regional systems.

The consultants' report was submitted in April and was substantially accepted by the Committee on University Affairs and approved by the Government. The key point in the policy adopted by the Government was the establishment of independent regional computer centres not connected with installations at individual universities. Investigational and start-up costs at regional centres would be financed direct by the Department of University Affairs and not through the universities. The regional centres would be developed one at a time to take care of increasing need and it was hoped to have the first regional centre

operational within a year or eighteen months. For the support of local computer centres at the universities, grants would be available only to provide hardware; the costs of supporting staff would be the responsibility of the universities. The hardware grants in 1968–69 will be equivalent to actual hardware costs for equipment committed at April 1, 1968, or to four-thirds of the amount budgeted for support staff if this is less; in either case grants from the National Research Council will be deducted from the provincial grant. On whatever basis it is calculated, the total hardware grant may not exceed $24 per basic income unit.

The Committee of Presidents considered the policy announced by the Government and informed the Minister that on the basis of present information it agreed that major emphasis should be on the development of service-oriented regional computer centres independent of any one university. The Presidents stated that they agreed specifically that planning for the first centre should proceed as quickly as possible and that to this end they had requested their Subcommittee on Computer Services to develop recommendations regarding the organization of the first and subsequent centres, including questions of location, services, participation, management and responsibility. The Committee also said that it welcomed the proposal for grants towards hardware costs of university computer installations but urged that there should be provision for support for reasonable expansion beyond commitments of April 1, 1968, where facilities would be required to meet essential needs of the universities before regional centres could be established, and that special provision be made for the needs of emergent universities.

In June agreement was reached between the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents that a joint Committee on Computer Services comprising three persons named by each of the two bodies should be established to study and advise on all questions relating to the establishment of the first regional centre. Dr. D. T. Wright, Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs, and Professor G. C. Gotlieb, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Computer Services, were appointed co-chairmen of the Committee on Computer Services. The two other members appointed to represent the Committee on University Affairs were Dr. R. J. Rossiter, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Western Ontario, and Dr. D. W. Slater, Dean of Graduate Studies, Queen's University. The two additional nominees of the Committee of Presidents were Dr. K. Okashimo of the University of Guelph and Mr. P. J. Lewis of Trent University.

The joint Committee met twice in July and agreed to have the original firm of consultants continue their studies of regional centres by investigating a number of alternative forms such centres might take and rating them according to several criteria which were outlined by the Committee. The Committee on Computer Services stated that it expected to have a preliminary report ready for submission to its two parent bodies by the fall and a final report at the end of 1968.

TELEVISION IN THE UNIVERSITY

In February 1968, the Minister of Education announced in the Ontario Legislature the intention of the Government to set up an Ontario Educational Broadcasting Authority to be responsible for the production of educational television programmes in Ontario. The board of the Authority will include representatives of the universities, teachers, school board trustees and adult education and home-and-school associations. The Committee of Presidents was particularly gratified by the announcement of this policy, since the Presidents, on the recommendation of the Ontario Universities' Television Council, had written to the Minister in November 1967 urging him to appoint an independent, widely representative educational television commission.

The Ontario Universities' Television Council, which was first established as an affiliate of the Committee of Presidents in 1965, has the task of advising and assisting universities in the development and use of television teaching when requested. In September 1967, the Television Council opened a central office located at the Scarborough College campus of the University of Toronto, under the supervision of a part-time executive assistant. This office, which was recently moved to 2149 Yonge Street, Toronto, serves as a centre for information and advice on university television for Ontario.

For 1967–68 the Television Council entered into an agreement with the Television Committee of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada for the Ontario office to provide services for the national organization. There was also an agreement with the Commission interuniversitaire des cours télévisés et radiodiffusés, organized by French-language universities in Canada, to cooperate in areas of mutual concern and to exchange observers at meetings.

Among the activities of the Television Council during the year was a two-day conference on "Television in the University," held at McMaster University, Hamilton, in December 1967. The purpose of the

conference was to bring together academic and senior administrative staff members of Ontario universities to focus attention on the role and use of new media in higher education in Ontario, and to hear as many viewpoints as possible expressed about the value and function of television in specific academic applications.

In February 1968 a joint delegation representing the Ontario Universities' Television Council, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Commission interuniversitaire des cours télévisés et radiodiffusés presented a brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts during the Committee's hearings on amendments to the Broadcasting Act proposed by the Government of Canada. The brief had been prepared jointly by the three sponsoring bodies and endorsed by the Committee of Presidents. The main recommendation of the brief was that there should be a national educational radio and television broadcasting agency responsible, in cooperation with provincial authorities, for the development of facilities for the distribution of educational programmes serving both the English- and the French-speaking population across Canada. It was expected that such an agency would cooperate closely with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and with private broadcasters. Another point made in the brief was that educational needs should receive full consideration along with all others when transmission facilities were being assigned; the sponsors of the brief were therefore opposed to any suggestion that educational television should be restricted to UHF channels. Nevertheless, recognizing that the limited number of VHF channels available would necessitate the use of many UHF channels for educational broadcasting, the brief urged the Federal Government to give assistance to the public to convert existing television receivers to permit UHF reception and to require that all television receivers sold in Canada should be equipped to receive all channels.

4. The Formula Approach to Financing

ON FORMULA

The first year's experience of the working of the operating grants formula has justified expectation that it would ensure distribution of grants to universities in an equitable manner and give each university substantial freedom to budget in accordance with its own priorities. Under the formula each category of student has been assigned a weight ranging from one for undergraduate arts and science to six for advanced Ph.D. work. Each university's weighted enrolment as of December 1 is multiplied by the value of a "basic income unit," which is roughly equivalent to the cost of educating one undergraduate for one year in a liberal arts course, and the university's grant is calculated by subtracting standard fees from the product.

While the formula ensures equitable distribution of available funds, the adequacy of the total grant received by each university depends on the value of the basic income unit. The value of the unit is determined annually by the Government on the advice of the Committee on University Affairs. The value fixed for the unit in 1967–68 was $1,320. The Presidents considered this too low and decided that the universities would pool their data and ask the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae to undertake the preparation of a carefully documented submission on an appropriate value of the basic income unit in 1968–69. Two meetings were held with the Committee on University Affairs, in August 1967 and January 1968, in support of the Presidents' submission. The brief presented at these meetings suggested an increase of at least 15% in the value of the basic income unit would be needed in 1968–69 to make up for some of the ground lost as a result of the low value of the unit set in 1967–68, especially to build up library collections and to allow the universities to pay faculty salaries that would enable Ontario to compete in the international market for staff.

In March 1968 grants to universities for 1968–69 were announced. The value of the basic income unit was set at $1,450, an increase of

approximately 10% over the previous year. The Committee of Presidents met immediately after the announcement to consider the implications of the shortfall in revenues for the ensuing year that would result. At that meeting, the Committee decided to issue a public statement expressing concern at the level of provincial operating grants to the universities of Ontario for 1968–69. The statement applauded the Government's decision to give education the highest priority in its expenditure for the coming fiscal year and recognized the necessity of restraining the rate of Government spending in keeping with the Province's resources. However, the Presidents said that they felt bound to point out the implications for the social and economic progress of Ontario of failing to invest the sums needed to operate the universities at an appropriate level. The statement pointed out that the level of grants announced would reduce the universities' ability to hire additional staff in sufficient numbers to maintain existing faculty-student ratios in the face of the 12% rise in enrolment expected in the following year, with the result that classes would be larger and there would be a reduction in already insufficient opportunities for enriching contact between faculty and students. Particularly serious also, the statement said, would be the effect on libraries. Another unfortunate feature to which the statement drew attention was the slowing-down or postponement of new programmes that would result. The long-term effect of these constraints would be especially severe, the statement noted, since it seemed clear that growth in the modern economy was in considerable measure a factor of the number and quality of people with university training in key fields.

In spite of the disappointing level of grants announced for 1968–69, the Committee of Presidents considers that the effort expended in the preparation of the brief on the value of the basic income unit was worthwhile. A similar analysis of university costs in 1969–70 was therefore undertaken and preliminary indications of the required level of operating grants for that year were presented to the Committee on University Affairs at a meeting in September 1968. A further joint meeting to consider this question will be held in December.

As with any new procedure, difficulties of interpretation and application of the formula came to light during the year. One difficulty that arose was whether students in undifferentiated courses should be counted as general or as honours students under the formula. Some universities prefer not to distinguish between honours and general courses until the later years, and if all students in undifferentiated courses were considered as being in general courses serious loss of

revenue would result since general arts and science students have a weight of 1 under the formula while honours students in the second and later years have a weight of 1.5. This matter was taken up with the Government and agreement was reached that students in courses which were not specifically designated as honours would for purposes of the operating grants formula be counted in accordance with the assessment of the university concerned in consultation with the Department of University Affairs.

Another difficulty arose in connection with the manner of counting graduate students for formula purposes. As a matter of administrative convenience the universities were asked to report graduate enrolment three times a year but it was later found that the counting of graduate enrolment on a semester-by-semester basis would significantly reduce the income produced by graduate students under the formula. In response to a request by the Committee of Presidents the Government agreed not to implement the strict semester-by-semester count in 1967–68 or the following year pending further study and discussion. The matter is now being studied by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Subcommittee on Operating Grants, and the Committee of Presidents hopes shortly to be able to propose a solution of the problem.

The weights for the various categories of students now in effect were based on the best available knowledge of the cost of university education in Ontario at the time they were adopted. However, the cost data on which the weights were based were not very exact and the Presidents consider that the weights should be reviewed when more exact cost data become available. The universities of Ontario are cooperating in a study of operating costs in Canadian universities sponsored jointly by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Canadian Association of University Business Officers. Out of this study it is hoped more reliable information on costs will emerge. In one area, medical education, costs have escalated rapidly in the past two years and the existing weights have become inadequate. The Government has therefore set up a committee comprising representatives drawn from the universities, the Committee on University Affairs, the Ontario Department of Health and the Ontario Hospital Services Commission to advise whether the weight of the medical student under the formula should be increased or whether medical education should receive additional financial support in some other way. The first meeting of the new committee was held in July 1968.

Now that grants to universities are based on total enrolment and on the classification of students into weighted categories, accuracy of enrolment count and of classification has become of paramount importance. The Department of University Affairs indicated in March 1968 that it considered that some type of audit procedure should be established so that all concerned might have an assurance that enrolment figures had been accurately calculated and classified. The Committee of Presidents agreed with this proposition and in April adopted and conveyed to the Department a resolution favouring the institution for each university of an audit of enrolment certified by an independent auditor engaged by the university concerned.

In April 1968 Mr. Bernard Trotter retired from the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae. The Subcommittee had originally been an outgrowth of the Subcommittee on Research and Planning and had been set up with the specific purpose of working with members of the Committee on University Affairs in the studies which led to the introduction of the operating grants formula. In June the Subcommittee's terms of reference were broadened to give it responsibility for all matters pertaining to the operating grants system and its membership was expanded from three to five. To mark these changes the name of the Subcommittee was changed to Subcommittee on Operating Grants. Mr. B. L. Hansen, Director of Institutional Research in the University of Toronto, was named as its Chairman.

A PATH TO EMERGENCE

The pattern of support for the new universities in 1968–69 and subsequent years, adopted by the Government in March 1968, is a matter of concern to the universities involved and to the Committee of Presidents as a whole. The Government's plan of support to the emergent universities is based on a time scale for development. Each of the universities concerned is to receive a supplementary grant of a stated percentage of the grant produced by the standard formula, diminishing annually over the next few years until the university receives nothing over and above the standard formula grant.

Late in 1966, the Committee of Presidents had appointed a Subcommittee on the Financing of Emergent Universities to develop a means for defining such institutions and to devise an appropriate pattern for financial support as these universities grew from emergent to emerged status. A year later, the Subcommittee presented a report which was accepted by the Committee of Presidents. The report

recognized that there was need for special provision for emergent universities because they do not enjoy the economies of scale; while the emergent universities must provide facilities approximating the basic facilities of established institutions, their initial enrolments are small and therefore produce limited income under the operating grants formula. The report envisaged a "point of emergence" based on a scale of development measured in basic income units rather than on a simple time scale, and proposed a formula which would provide for high support at inception with support per basic income unit decreasing until an agreed point in weighted enrolment was reached.

It was agreed that a group representing the Committee of Presidents would meet with members of the Committee on University Affairs to discuss the proposals contained in the report of the Subcommittee on the Financing of Emergent Universities. Two joint meetings were held early in 1968 and it was expected that further meetings would be held. However, before the discussions could be resumed, the Government's decision to adopt a time-scale formula was communicated to the presidents of the universities concerned. These presidents sought and obtained a meeting with the Minister of University Affairs in April, at which time the Minister said he would ask the Committee on University Affairs or a subcommittee thereof to meet with the presidents of the four emergent universities and review with them the special supplementary grants for the coming year, and discuss long-term planning of support for the emergent universities.

A special study subcommittee was set up by the Committee on University Affairs to study and report on operating support for emergent universities in 1968–69. The subcommittee reported in July and its report was accepted by the Government and made available to the Presidents in September. With respect to Lakehead University, the subcommittee recommended that the rate of decrease in the extra-formula premium for emergent status be reviewed carefully from year to year, and that the actual reduction in any year be somewhat less than the actual proportional increase in enrolment. For Brock and Trent universities, the extra-formula premium for 1968–69 was to be increased from 80% of formula income to 85%; also, if revised enrolment targets at these universities in 1968–69 were not realized, grants would be paid as if at least 40 additional full-time students had enrolled. The data requested by the subcommittee for its study were not available from Laurentian University and no recommendations were made in respect of that University.

In addition to the specific recommendations noted in the preceding paragraph, the study subcommittee recorded its view that the general strategy of development of the emergent universities in the next few years should be to limit very severely the growth of new courses and the addition of staff for undergraduate teaching; to weed out the excessive richness of present course offerings; to expand their student numbers quite considerably so that the student-faculty ratios and the average sizes of course-section increase substantially and to reduce their costs per student and per student-course substantially so that these institutions might be able to live on formula income relatively soon.

The Committee of Presidents agreed that the presidents of the emergent universities should meet with the Presidents' Subcommittee on Operating Grants to consider the implications of the report of the study subcommittee and report later to the full Committee of Presidents.

The Committee of Presidents expressed concern not only at the pattern of financial support for emergent universities adopted by the Government, but also at the actual level of support in 1968–69 announced in March 1968. As mentioned in the preceding section, when operating grants for 1968–69 were announced the Committee of Presidents met and later issued a public statement pointing out the implications of the disappointing level of provincial support to universities. The final paragraph of that statement was devoted to the plight of the emergent universities. It stated that financial stringency for the newer universities would mean not simply a slowing-down in their capacity to absorb the ever-growing numbers seeking higher education, but would also place severe limitations on their ability to introduce much-needed new programmes, including programmes of special relevance to their regions, and would delay their progress towards that variety and breadth and excellence that a university education in Ontario had come to mean.

Having produced a report recommending a special formula for financing emergent universities, the Subcommittee on the Financing of Emergent Universities considered that it had done as much as it could within its terms of reference and asked to be discharged. In June 1968, the Presidents acceded to the Subcommittee's request and it was discharged with appreciation. Matters relating to the financing of emergent universities will in future be the responsibility of the Subcommittee on Operating Grants.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SMITH REPORT ON TAXATION

Publication of the report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation in 1967, commonly referred to as the Smith Report, prompted the Committee of Presidents to state its position on several of the recommendations in the report which were likely to have implications for the financing of universities and other institutions of higher learning. One recommendation of the Smith Report proposed to end the exemption of universities from municipal taxes, substituting provincial grants to approved institutions in lieu of tax exemptions. Another set of recommendations proposed the removal of existing sales tax exemptions on tangible items, including library books, purchased by universities and other educational institutions, with additional grants to compensate for the removal of these exemptions. The Committee of Presidents stated its agreement with the general principles of these recommendations but expressed certain reservations and pointed out some of the implications of adopting them.

Concerning the Smith Committee's proposal to remove municipal tax exemptions, the Committee of Presidents urged that provincial grants in lieu of such exemptions should be paid direct to the municipalities on behalf of the universities. Regarding the proposal to remove sales tax exemptions, the Presidents, on the recommendation of their Subcommittee on Research and Planning, urged retention of the exemptions on books and periodicals on the grounds that to remove them would impose a "tax on knowledge" and would be a retrograde step for education generally, affecting purchases of books and periodicals not only by university libraries but by students and the general reading public as well.

One major reservation of the Committee of Presidents on the Smith recommendation to substitute provincial grants for both the municipal and sales tax exemptions is the adverse effect implementation of these proposals might have on the financing of the church-related institutions. To protect the financial position of these institutions, the Committee of Presidents urged, in the case of the proposed removal of municipal tax exemptions, that all institutions of higher learning in Ontario that are now exempt from municipal taxation should be recognized by the Province as "approved institutions" for the purposes of grants in lieu of municipal tax exemption. The financial position of the church-related institutions would also be adversely affected by substitution of provincial grants for sales tax exemptions. Under financing arrangements adopted by the Province after the Federal

Government withdrew from the field of direct support of universities, church-related institutions receive support calculated in accordance with the operating grants formula, equivalent to only 50% of the grants they would receive if they did not have a religious affiliation. They would therefore not receive full compensation if the grants in lieu of exemption were formula-based.

A Select Committee of the Legislature was set up to study the recommendations of the Smith Report. The Select Committee reported on September 16 and the Government has announced that a White Paper on tax reform will be prepared in the light of the report of the Select Committee. The Government has intimated that careful consideration will have to be given to the implications of acting on the proposals of the Committee of Presidents since their adoption would place a heavy additional burden on the Provincial Treasury.

CAPITAL FINANCING—THE SHORT-TERM SOLUTION

Considerable relief was afforded to the universities, hard-pressed to find their share of capital funds under previous arrangements, by a new interim policy of the Government of Ontario announced early in 1968 for the payment of capital grants. The previous arrangements required the universities to find 15% of the cost of academic facilities, and 50% in the case of other projects. Under the new policy the distinction between academic facilities and other buildings has been ended and the government has undertaken to pay 85% of the approved cost of projects for the first $10 million of expenditure in each university since July 1, 1964, and 95% of approved cost for expenditures in excess of $10 million. The interim policy will remain in effect until June 30, 1969. The Committee of Presidents welcomed it as going a long way towards enabling the universities to carry on with expansion plans up to that time, while efforts are being made to find an objective basis for the distribution of capital funds.

The interim policy for capital financing was adopted by the Government on the recommendation of the Committee on University Affairs after discussions between members of that Committee and representatives of the Committee of Presidents. Along with the adoption of the interim policy went a change in the procedure for the approval of capital projects. Previously, building projects of the universities were submitted to the Department of University Affairs individually. The Department examined each project for conformity to various standards and gave approval if the project met those standards. There was no

overall review of universities' building plans. Under the new policy, the Committee on University Affairs is given the task of reviewing the universities' plans as a whole, and of deciding on the degree of priority to be given to the various projects. The Committee exercised its new powers for the first time by holding up approvals for new facilities for libraries, engineering and geology, pending justification by the universities of the need for expansion in these areas.

The Province has announced that in 1968–69 a ceiling will be placed for the first time on the total appropriated for capital grants to universities. The amount set aside for capital projects in that year is $125 million. This is appreciably less than the total value of capital construction planned by the universities in 1968–69, and the imposition of the ceiling has led to a cutback in a number of areas. The Committee of Presidents is of course sympathetic to the problems confronting the Provincial Government in the economic climate prevailing when the limitation was placed on capital funds; nevertheless, the Presidents are apprehensive of the effect it will have on the concerted efforts that must be made to meet the projected demand for student places in the next few years.

THE SEARCH FOR A CAPITAL FORMULA

Experience with the liberating effects of the operating grants formula leaves little doubt that university autonomy will be enhanced if an appropriate formula for the distribution of capital funds can be devised. Much, however, will depend on the kind of formula developed because a poorly conceived formula may be found to be constricting rather than liberating and can lead to a dull uniformity of purely utilitarian buildings repeated endlessly from one campus to another. The Committee of Presidents is therefore concerned to see that the studies now under way with a view to the development of a formula for capital financing shall be as thorough and as thoughtful as possible.

In June 1967 a joint Capital Studies Committee, comprising three persons appointed by the Committee on University Affairs and three named by the Committee of Presidents, was set up to guide the studies which were to be undertaken in connection with the search for long-term solutions to the problem of capital financing. In the fall of 1967 the Capital Studies Committee engaged consultants to undertake two such studies. The first of these studies, the Ontario Universities' Physical Resources Survey, is concerned with collecting information on space utilization and making analyses and reports regarding the

physical plant at each university, and the effectiveness with which physical resources are being used. The study will also include investigation of techniques for assessing future needs, possibly on a formula basis as with operating grants. The second study will comprise comparative analyses of practices in other jurisdictions. The consultants are working to an eighteen-month time-table from January 1968. Each university has provided a liaison officer who has the responsibility of advising whether the method of survey proposed is compatible with existing studies and data-gathering in his university. The consultants provide supervisory and field personnel but it is hoped to make maximum use of university personnel since they will continue the programme in future years.

Regarding the financing of the Ontario Universities' Physical Resources Survey, it was agreed that the Government would pay the cost of engaging the consultants as well as the cost of processing the data gathered from the various universities. Each university will pay the costs incurred on its own campus in carrying out the studies needed to cooperate with the consultants, including the cost of collecting the raw data.

The consultants prepared a questionnaire and circulated it to the universities at the beginning of 1968. It was proposed that data collection for the survey should begin immediately, with February being considered as the base month, and universities were asked to have the physical measurement of their facilities completed by March 31 if possible. This time-table proved to be impractical and considerable modifications were later introduced.

At a meeting of the Committee of Presidents held in May, considerable concern was expressed at the extent of the detail called for by the consultants' questionnaire. Some apprehension was also expressed about the uses to which the data being gathered would be put and the kind of formula that might be developed. To allow the whole question to be thoroughly aired, it was agreed that the six members of the Capital Studies Committee should be invited to meet with the Committee of Presidents at a meeting to be held in June.

When the Capital Studies Committee met with the Committee of Presidents, it was reported that a number of simplifications had been introduced into the consultants' questionnaire. It was pointed out, however, that it was still necessary to ask for data in sufficient detail and that there was no way of knowing what was sufficient until the information had been gathered. Dr. D. T. Wright, Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs and of the Capital Studies Committee,

expressed the view that any capital formula developed should facilitate change and diversity. The Presidents welcomed this expression of opinion by Dr. Wright. To ensure accuracy of the information to be incorporated in the consultants' report, it has been agreed that each university will have an opportunity to go over its own data with the consultants. It has also been agreed that the report of the consultants will be made available to the Committee of Presidents as soon as it is submitted to the Capital Studies Committee so that the Presidents may have an opportunity to meet and make their general views known to their representatives on the Capital Studies Committee before the latter Committee formulates policy recommendations.

EXPERIMENTING WITH A NEW SYSTEM OF SPACE UTILIZATION

Late in 1967, the Government of Ontario announced that special supplementary grants would be made to the University of Waterloo to enable that University to experiment with transplanting and adapting Purdue University's system of controlling space utilization and time-tabling. The application by the University of Waterloo for special grants was warmly supported by the Committee of Presidents because if the Purdue system is applied successfully at that University it will be made available at cost to any other universities in Ontario wanting it. Work on the Purdue system at the University of Waterloo began in February 1968. The student scheduling techniques, suitably adapted to Waterloo conditions, were used for the September 1968 registration of arts, science and mathematics students. The university is most satisfied with the results and will shortly be ready to make the procedures available to other Ontario universities.

5. Involving the Student

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

Widespread attention, on the part of the public as well as of the parties immediately involved, continues to be given to the role students should play in the government of the university. Incidents at a number of Canadian and American universities during the year brought the question into sharper focus. Ontario universities have had committees at work studying the Duff/Berdahl[1] recommendations with a view to framing proposals for possible revisions of their governing structure. In a number of universities these studies have produced proposals for greater student participation on bodies at various levels within the university, including the senate. Implementation of the proposals is proceeding at these universities, and several now have student members on their senates.

The Committee of Presidents is, naturally, concerned with the role of the student in university government but is strongly of the opinion that the manner of governance of the universities is not a matter for collective decision and that each university should be free to develop the pattern of internal government best suited to its own needs. However, the Presidents did ask their Subcommittee on Research and Planning to prepare a working paper on student participation for consideration by the Committee of Presidents and for later discussion on the individual campuses. The paper prepared by the Subcommittee was considered by the Presidents at a meeting in November 1967, attended also by representatives of boards of governors of the universities. At this meeting it was agreed that the paper should be released immediately as a basis for discussion within the Ontario university community, and that the Subcommittee on Research and Planning

[1]James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, *University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada* (Toronto, 1966).

should be asked to edit it for publication. The paper[2] was published in January 1968.

The Foreword of the publication clearly set out the purpose of the paper:

> It is not in any sense a declaration of policy. It merely seeks to place the matter of student involvement in the context of the universities' basic goals. The hope of the Presidents, in making it generally available, is that it will be a useful contribution to the discussions of university government that are taking place on individual campuses.[3]

Student Participation in University Government examined the function and the nature of the university, and argued that it would not be appropriate to re-form it on the model of a political democracy (which was the aim of many of the student activists) principally on the ground that excellence, rather than the maintenance of law and order, was at stake in the university. The study paper came to the conclusion that "the case for student participation at the working level appears so strong as to be practically incontrovertible."[4] It weighed the arguments for and against student membership of the highest administrative bodies in the universities, and called for continuation of the dialogue at each university so that the question might be resolved pragmatically at whatever level and with whatever combination of senior and junior members was best suited to that university.

This publication was given wide distribution throughout Ontario and in other jurisdictions. There was an interested reaction from the press and a favourable response from those concerned with higher education in an administrative or academic capacity in Canada, the United States and elsewhere (copies have been requested from as far away as Switzerland and South Africa). Comment by student leaders was unfavourable. A reply to *Student Participation* was prepared by the Ontario Union of Students and sent to the Committee of Presidents. The authors of the reply stated that its purpose was to correct certain assumptions made by the authors of *Student Participation* regarding the students' position and arguments about university government, and that the reply was prepared so that those reading the original paper would not be led to believe that the students' points were accurately described in it.

The justice of one of the students' criticisms of the study paper could

[2]*Student Participation in University Government: A study paper prepared for the Committee of Presidents by its Subcommittee on Research and Planning* (Toronto, 1968).

[3]*Op. cit.*, p. iii.

[4]*Op. cit.*, p. 13.

not be denied – it had not been prepared in consultation with students. The Committee of Presidents therefore decided at the beginning of March 1968 that efforts should be made to arrange a meeting with the Ontario Union of Students to consider what form the dialogue on student participation in university government should take in the future. The executives of the two organizations met in May to discuss the holding of a joint meeting in the fall of 1968. Unfortunately, the idea of a joint meeting fell through when the students insisted that the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations should be invited to participate in the proposed meeting. The Presidents were of the opinion that a bipartite meeting between the Committee of Presidents and the Ontario Union of Students would be more appropriate and more fruitful since it would allow attention to be focused more directly on the students' concerns. They appreciated the students' principle that in discussions of matters touching the university community the faculty point of view should be represented, but they believed that this would be accomplished by the presidents' being accompanied at the proposed meeting by the academic colleagues elected by the senates of the universities.

Though immediate plans for a joint meeting did not materialize, the lines of communication with the students are being kept open. The Executive of the Committee of Presidents will meet with the Executive of the Ontario Union of Students at the latter's request should there arise any matters that the students think should be discussed with the Presidents.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT AWARDS

Unexpectedly heavy demands on the funds provided in 1967–68 for the Ontario Student Awards Program have brought unfortunate repercussions in their train. Early in 1968 it became known that the budgeted provision for the Program was likely to be exceeded by some $12 million, and that the cost of the Program in 1967–68 would probably be four times the total amount paid out the previous year. An official of the Department of University Affairs was quoted in the press as attributing the sharp increase in grants under the Student Awards Program partly to cheating by applicants. Later, the Deputy Minister of University Affairs stated publicly that his Department had no evidence that there had been any substantial degree of deception within the applications for student awards that had been submitted. He went on to say, however, that having heard the suggestions that there had

been cheating, his Department would of necessity check the matter thoroughly. Later, the Minister of University Affairs stated in reply to a question in the Ontario Legislature that investigation had shown that the vast majority of students applying for assistance were doing so honestly. However, in September the Department announced that a more extensive procedure for auditing student award applications would be put into effect.

As the administration of the Student Awards Program had been partly decentralized for the first time in 1967–68, with student awards officers in the universities handling applications for assistance under the Program, the universities could not take a detached view of suggestions that there had been cheating by applicants. The Presidents' Subcommittee on Student Aid therefore looked into the matter and reported to the Committee of Presidents at the beginning of March that it had found no evidence that there had been widespread abuse of the Program by students enrolled in Ontario universities. While there had been some cases of misrepresentation, the Subcommittee stated that it seemed clear that the universities were doing everything that could reasonably be expected to guard against possible misuse of the Program. The Subcommittee came to the conclusion that the steep rise in the amount paid out under the Program in 1967–68 was due, not to any considerable abuse, but to the general increase in enrolment in post-secondary institutions in Ontario, including the new colleges of applied arts and technology, and to the provision introduced into the Program for the first time that year that a student who had successfully completed three years of post-secondary education would be considered independent of his parents.

Details of the Student Awards Program for 1968–69 were announced early in April 1968. The general basis on which awards would be made remained unchanged: the first $150 of any award would again be given in the form of a loan, the next $750 would be in the proportions 60% loan and 40% grant, and the remainder of any award beyond $900 would be in the form of a non-repayable grant. Some improvements were introduced: the cost-of-living allowance for dependent students living at home was raised from $350 to $400, and married students would in future be permitted to claim as allowable costs the equivalent of the cost of board and lodging in the local area as specified by the institution concerned, instead of being limited to a flat amount of $350. The parental contribution table was revised to bring the level of contribution parents would be expected to make more into line with their ability to assist their children financially.

As a disappointing consequence of the heavy over-expenditure in 1967–68, certain features of the Program for 1968–69 will be less favourable than they were the year before. The conditions under which a student can be considered independent of his parents have been made more stringent. These conditions had been broadened in 1967–68 to include those who were married, those who had completed three successful years of post-secondary education, and those who had been employed in a full-time job for at least twelve consecutive months. For 1968–69, the applicant must have been married before the start of the academic year for which he is requesting assistance; he must have completed four, instead of three, years of post-secondary education; and he will be considered independent on the ground that he has worked for a year before enrolling in his programme only if he is 21 years old and provides a declaration of financial independence signed by his parent or guardian. Some changes were also made in the conditions governing allowable costs under the Program: for example, in future a student will be allowed the cost of only one return trip home a year instead of two.

The Committee of Presidents is of course not happy at the reductions in the Student Awards Program for 1968–69. Substantial improvements had been made in the Program in 1967–68, and the Ontario Committee on Student Awards, a broadly representative body set up to advise the Minister, had proposed further improvements for 1968–69 in a report presented to the Minister in December 1967. Unfortunately, a number of these proposals were not implemented. However, the Presidents realize that some control must be exercised over the escalating costs of the Program and believe that at a time of financial stringency in the provincial budget the Government has made real efforts to continue the essential features of the Program. They hope that economic conditions in future years will permit the Program to be improved and strengthened.

There were certain features of the Student Awards Program for 1968–69 which the Presidents' Subcommittee on Student Aid thought should be taken up with the Minister of University Affairs. These features related to eligibility under the Program of students from other provinces and landed immigrants. A Canadian from another province whose family is not resident in Ontario has not been eligible for grants until he has resided in Ontario for twelve months. If he enters a programme of post-secondary education before he has been here for twelve months, he is debarred from receiving grants during the whole period of his educational programme. For 1968–69 the Government

decided to treat landed immigrants in the same way. Regarding students from other provinces, the Subcommittee suggested that the Minister should be asked to urge upon the Council of Ministers of Education the importance of achieving in all Canadian provinces a standard plan of student aid, and to explore with the Council ways and means of initiating such a plan from provincial and federal resources. Extension to landed immigrants of the restrictions previously applied to Canadians from other provinces was regrettable, the Subcommittee thought, especially as it had been made retroactive and would make some landed immigrants who were enrolled in educational programmes, and who had been receiving grants, eligible only for loans in the future. The Committee of Presidents raised these questions with the Minister in June 1968. In response, the Deputy Minister acknowledged that the question of a standard plan of student aid for all of Canada was a legitimate area for discussion by the Council of Ministers of Education, though he thought the goal could not be quickly attained. With regard to landed immigrants, the Deputy Minister said his Department would review the current policy and see whether reasonable changes could be made.

While the short-term recommendations of the Ontario Student Awards Committee for improvements in the Student Awards Program were not accepted in full, that Committee had been partly instrumental in getting under way a study of the finances of Ontario post-secondary students. The study is being carried out by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Information has been gathered from aided and unaided students on their actual income and expenditures for the academic year 1967–68 and the summer of 1967; from it conclusions will be drawn as to the adequacy of the present formula for student aid. The Committee of Presidents supported the idea of the study and the universities cooperated with the Institute in getting it under way.

SUPPORT FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

The Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program, inaugurated in 1962 with the object of attracting people into the profession of university teaching, was extended during the year to include graduate students in law, engineering and library science. The Program was originally intended to support mainly candidates in the humanities and social sciences, but there was a quota for pure science and mathematics students with a clear interest in a university teaching career. In Sep-

tember 1967 the Committee of Presidents authorized the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies to submit a brief to the Government urging, among other matters, extension of the Fellowship Program to engineering and law in view of the demonstrated need for more adequate support for graduate students in these disciplines in Ontario. The Government accepted this recommendation and in addition brought its existing programme of fellowships for library science into the general Graduate Fellowship Program.

Two other recommendations contained in the brief of the Council on Graduate Studies were substantially implemented by the Government. The Council recommended that the number of fellowships awarded annually should be adjusted by a factor corresponding to the increase in the number of students registered in the eligible disciplines for the previous year. Further, the Government was asked to provide fifty additional fellowships to be allocated to universities with emergent graduate schools. Certain other proposals of the Council on Graduate Studies were not accepted. These were that the Graduate Fellowship stipend should be increased from $1,500 to $2,000, that the summer supplement should be raised from $500 to $1,000, and that the maximum that a Ph.D. student could receive under the Program should be increased from $6,000 to $9,000, with a corresponding increase for students in master's programmes.

No progress has been made on the question of graduate awards by universities out of formula income. The universities consider it important to make discretionary awards to graduate students in cases where a student does not qualify under the Graduate Fellowship Program, or as a supplement to the regular award. Early in 1967 the Government ruled that operating grants derived from the formula could not be used to make discretionary awards, though the universities could, if they wished, use funds available to them from other sources to make such awards. The Committee of Presidents asked the Council on Graduate Studies to consider this problem. The Council proposed that the Government should be asked to allow universities to use formula income to provide fellowships for graduate students, on condition that the amount of each award would not exceed $1,000 for a student in a pre-requisite year, $4,000 for a student in the first year of graduate study, and $5,000 for a student in the second or subsequent years. The Presidents endorsed this proposal and it was included in the brief on the support of graduate students presented by the Council on Graduate Studies. The recommendation was not accepted by the Government.

Though students in Master of Library Science courses are now

eligible for Graduate Fellowship Program awards, this is not the case with students in programmes leading to the degree of Bachelor of Library Science, for which a bachelor's degree in arts or science is a prerequisite. In February 1968 the Ontario Council of University Librarians warmly supported a proposal by the deans and directors of Ontario library schools that B.L.S. students should be eligible for special fellowship awards of an annual value of not less than $500. The Committee of Presidents requested the Ontario Council on Graduate Study to consider this proposal and to advise whether B.L.S. students, and students in other courses at that level, should be eligible for Graduate Fellowship awards, or for some other special kind of support. There is some difficulty in defining what constitutes graduate work in library science, but the position should be clarified by definitions recently adopted by representatives of library schools in Canada that library studies should be spread over four terms, the first two to be considered as basic library science and the remaining two as graduate work.

The December 1967 report to the Minister of University Affairs by the Ontario Committee on Student Awards, to which reference was made in the preceding section, addressed itself in part to the Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program. The Committee of Presidents recognized that there was nothing in the terms of reference of the Committee on Student Awards precluding it from dealing with graduate awards, but had assumed that the latter would continue to be dealt with by the Committee on University Affairs in consultation with the Committee of Presidents and the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. In March 1968 a letter was sent to the Minister on behalf of the Presidents asking to have graduate awards excluded from the terms of reference of the Ontario Committee on Student Awards, and proposing a return to the alternative method of consultation. The Minister in reply proposed that the Committee on Student Awards should be left free to consider graduate fellowships if it wished, but that any proposals it might wish to make on such awards should be forwarded to the Committee on University Affairs, which could then consult as required with the Committee of Presidents and the Council on Graduate Studies.

STUDENT HOUSING

It was announced during the year that the previous method by which the Government of Ontario gave financial assistance to the

universities for the construction of student residences would be terminated. This method provided for a grant of $1,400 per bed where the total cost per bed did not exceed $7,000, together with a mortgage not exceeding $4,200 per bed from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. When the Ontario Student Housing Corporation was established in 1966 the universities were given the option of continuing to finance residence construction under the old method. Now, the only way in which residence construction will be financed by the Province is through the Student Housing Corporation which builds or acquires residences and leases them back to the universities for a fifty-year period, with the full cost of the mortgage being met by the universities out of charges to students.

The alternative method now ended had not been used by the universities after the Student Housing Corporation began operations because under it the universities were required to find from their own resources the difference between the total cost per bed and the amount made available in grant and mortgage. The new method does not require the university to provide any capital but it does require full amortization costs to be met from charges to students, and this could force residence fees up to levels beyond the resources of the students. The Committee of Presidents had asked the Government in October 1966 to pay a subsidy on residences built by the Ontario Student Housing Corporation, but the Government did not respond to this request. It should be stated that the Student Housing Corporation has been able to build residences at lower costs than the average that prevailed before the Corporation was formed. This, coupled with the fact that dining facilities in residences will in future not be financed by mortgage but by 95% grant under the interim capital policy adopted by the Government early in 1968, should ease the amortization problem and offer some hope that residence fees will be held to tolerable levels. The financing of student housing is likely, however, to remain a critical issue for some time.

Concern was expressed by the Committee of Presidents not only at the likely cost of residence fees in student housing financed through the Ontario Student Housing Corporation, but also at the procedures by which the Corporation operates. The university prepares a written programme for the construction of a student residence, on the basis of which the Student Housing Corporation calls for builders' proposals. The drawback of this procedure is that the builders' proposals may conform to the written programme in a purely mechanical way, falling short of the university's standards especially in regard to architectural

design. This situation was drawn to the attention of the Minister of University Affairs in September 1967 and it appears that in most cases differences between the Corporation and universities with student housing projects have since then been resolved. Another aspect of this matter appeared to the Committee of Presidents to be unsatisfactory —the fact that there is no university representation on the Board of Directors of the Ontario Student Housing Corporation. The letter to the Minister in September 1967 expressed regret at this lack of representation and asked him to secure appointment to the Board of Directors of a member nominated by the Committee of Presidents. The reaction to this request was sympathetic and it is to be hoped that the efforts being made to secure representation for the universities will shortly bear fruit.

The problems involved in the mechanics of the financing and construction of student housing should not be allowed to obscure enquiry into the educational and human objectives to be served. On October 19, 1967, the Subcommittee on Research and Planning and the Subcommittee on Capital Financing of the Committee of Presidents sponsored a joint meeting in Toronto to exchange ideas on both philosophy and practice in respect to student housing. The meeting was attended also by representatives of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Ontario Student Housing Corporation and a team engaged in a study of student housing sponsored jointly by CMHC and by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. A number of useful ideas were generated by the one-day meeting.

Responsibility for student housing had originally been assigned by the Presidents to the Subcommittee on Capital Financing and arrangements for follow-up of the October 19 meeting fell to that Subcommittee. However, it later became clear that the Subcommittee had its hands full with other matters and could not be expected to devote to student housing the attention it deserved. On the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Capital Financing, the Committee of Presidents decided to set up a new Subcommittee on Student Housing, under the chairmanship of Professor D. F. Forster, Vice-Provost and Executive Assistant to the President of the University of Toronto. Membership of the Subcommittee will comprise about six to eight persons representing a variety of interests in student housing, including a student.

Terms of reference of the Subcommittee on Student Housing, approved by the Committee of Presidents in June 1968, require it to study generally problems in the provision and operation of student residences and to make recommendations to the Committee of Presi-

dents; more particularly, to establish space/cost standards and area factors, and to determine to what extent the construction of student housing requires subsidization. The Subcommittee is also charged with the responsibility of giving direction to the study and consideration of the various possible methods of contracting for residence design and construction which may prove to be economical, and acceptable to the universities. To ensure coordination, the Subcommittee will maintain liaison with other appropriate subcommittees of the Committee of Presidents, and with the Committee on University Affairs and the Ontario Student Housing Corporation. The Subcommittee has been asked to present an interim report to the Committee of Presidents covering questions of space/cost standards and area factors, the need for subsidization, and methods of contracting for residence design and construction. The Committee on University Affairs has expressed interest in the possibility of meeting with the Subcommittee on Student Housing after the latter has held preliminary discussions. The stage has therefore been set for concrete action in this important area.

Appendix A

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO, OBSERVERS, AND OFFICERS OF THE SECRETARIAT

at October 1, 1968

MEMBERS

Brock University—Dr. James A. Gibson, President
Carleton University—Dr. A. Davidson Dunton, President (Chairman)*
University of Guelph—Dr. W. C. Winegard, President
Lakehead University—Dr. W. G. Tamblyn, President
Laurentian University of Sudbury—S. G. Mullins, M.A., President*
McMaster University—Dr. H. G. Thode, President*
Université d'Ottawa—T. R. P. Roger Guindon, Recteur*
Queen's University at Kingston—Dr. John J. Deutsch, Principal
University of Toronto—Dr. Claude T. Bissell, President
Trent University—T. H. B. Symons, M.A., President
University of Waterloo—Dr. J. G. Hagey, President
University of Western Ontario—Dr. D. C. Williams, President*
University of Windsor—Dr. J. F. Leddy, President
York University—Dr. M. G. Ross, President

OBSERVERS

Royal Military College—Commodore W. P. Hayes, Commandant
Waterloo Lutheran University—Dr. F. C. Peters, President

OFFICERS OF THE SECRETARIAT

Dr. John B. Macdonald, Executive Vice-Chairman*
J. A. d'Oliveira, M.A., LL.B., Secretary
P. L. Haefling, B.A., Assistant Secretary

*Members of the Executive

Appendix B

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO/COMITÉ DES PRÉSIDENTS D'UNIVERSITÉ DE L'ONTARIO

(adopted December 9, 1966; amended January 18, 1968, and April 26, 1968*)

1. *Name*

(1) The name of this body shall be: "Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario/Comité des Présidents d'Université de l'Ontario."

2. *Objects*

(1) The objects of the Committee are to promote cooperation among the provincially assisted universities of Ontario, and between them and the Government of the Province, and, generally, to work for the improvement of higher education for the people of Ontario.

3. *Membership*

(1) Those eligible for membership are the executive heads of institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario which are in receipt of financial assistance from the Government of the Province of Ontario and have the power to grant university degrees (a power conferred by a legislative or parliamentary act or charter in which such authority is specifically stated) but excluding institutions whose power to grant degrees is limited to a single professional field.

(2) At the time of the coming into force of this constitution, members shall be the executive heads of the universities listed in Annex A attached.

(3) Others eligible for membership may be admitted if recommended by the Executive and approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting at a meeting of the Committee of Presidents.

4. *Officers*

(1) The Committee shall have a Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall serve without remuneration.

(2) The Committee shall have a Vice-Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall act for the Chairman in the absence of the latter. He, too, shall serve without remuneration.

(3) The Committee shall have as its senior paid officer an Executive

*The Committee was formed on December 3, 1962, but was without a formal constitution until December 9, 1966.

Vice-Chairman, appointed by the Executive with the concurrence of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Committee of Presidents. Included in his functions shall be those of secretary and treasurer of the Committee.

(4) The Committee may have other paid officers, and sub-staff, as deemed necessary by the Executive.

5. *Subcommittees*

(1) There shall be a subcommittee called "the Executive" composed of six members: the Chairman of the Committee of Presidents (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Vice-Chairman (who shall have no vote), and three others elected from and by the members of the Committee of Presidents – one from the larger universities, one from those of intermediate size, and one from the smaller universities. Its function is to guide the Committee of Presidents and, on occasion, to act for it between meetings of the Committee.

(2) There shall be a "Subcommittee on Nominations," named by the Chairman with the approval of the Executive. It shall propose candidates for the elective offices and for membership of the Executive. It may also, from time to time, assist in the selection of members of other subcommittees, and shall review subcommittee membership and terms of reference as provided for by subsection (5) below.

(3) There may be such other subcommittees (standing and special) as are deemed necessary.

(4) Members of standing subcommittees shall serve for terms of not more than two years. They may be re-appointed. Members of a special subcommittee normally will serve for the duration of the subcommittee.

(5) At least once every two years, normally after the election of officers and the naming of a new Executive, the Subcommittee on Nominations shall review the terms of reference and membership of subcommittees of the Committee of Presidents and suggest to the Executive such changes as may seem desirable.

6. *Affiliates*

(1) Other organizations or associations of personnel serving in the universities of Ontario may be affiliated to the Committee of Presidents.

(2) Such bodies may be established by the Committee of Presidents or may come into being on the initiative of others.

(3) Normally an affiliate would have some executive power delegated to it, explicitly or implicitly, by the Committee of Presidents.

(4) Affiliates shall be responsible to the Committee of Presidents with respect to those of their interests and functions which fall within the scope of the activities of that Committee.

7. *Meetings*

(1) The Committee of Presidents shall meet at least twice a year.

(2) Meetings of the Committee and of the Executive may be called by the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Vice-Chairman, or any three other members of the Committee.

(3) A member who is unable to attend a meeting of the Committee may be represented by a substitute of his choosing who will have power to vote at the meeting.

(4) Subcommittees will meet as required.

(5) A majority of the members of the Committee of Presidents or of a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for a meeting of the Committee or subcommittee concerned.

8. *Finance*

(1) The fiscal year of the Committee of Presidents shall end June 30.

(2) The chief source of financial support of the Committee shall be subscriptions paid by the universities whose executive heads are members of the Committee.

(3) The scale of membership subscriptions shall be set by action of the Committee.

(4) The Committee may receive additional financial support from other sources.

(5) The accounts of the Committee shall be audited by a firm of auditors appointed by authority of the Committee for terms of one year, renewable.

9. *Amendment*

(1) This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority of members of the Committee present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the proposed amendment is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

10. *Dissolution*

(1) The Committee of Presidents may be dissolved by a two-thirds majority of members of the Committee present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the motion for dissolution is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

(2) In the event of dissolution of the Committee of Presidents, all assets and property of the Committee shall, after payment of its just debts and obligations, be distributed to one or more charitable organizations in Canada, as may be determined by the Committee.

ANNEX A

Provincially assisted universities of Ontario whose executive heads were members of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario at December 9, 1966:

Brock University
Carleton University
University of Guelph
Lakehead University
Laurentian University of Sudbury
McMaster University
Université d'Ottawa
Queen's University at Kingston
University of Toronto
Trent University
University of Waterloo
University of Western Ontario
University of Windsor
York University

Appendix C

SUBCOMMITTEES AND AFFILIATES OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

(as at October 1, 1968)

1. *The Executive*

Task: To guide the Committee of Presidents and on occasion to act for it between meetings of the Committee.

Membership: Six members: The Chairman of the Committee of Presidents (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Vice-Chairman (who shall have no vote), and three others elected from and by the members of the Committee of Presidents, one from the larger universities, one from those of intermediate size and one from the smaller universities.

Chairman: Dr. A. D. Dunton, President, Carleton University.

2. *Subcommittee on Nominations*

Task: To propose candidates for elective offices and for membership of subcommittees.

Membership: Members shall be named by the Chairman of CPUO.

Chairman: Dr. M. G. Ross, President, York University.

3. *Subcommittee on Research and Planning*

Task: To suggest to the Committee of Presidents research and planning projects which should be undertaken for the development and improvement of higher education in Ontario; at the request of the Committee of Presidents to delineate research and planning projects of this sort and suggest procedures and personnel for carrying them out; to review and comment on the results of such projects for the guidance of the Committee of Presidents.

Membership: Ten or a dozen persons representing university administration and a variety of academic disciplines – persons with experience of social research and an interest in the Subcommittee's task.

Chairman: Dr. T. L. Batke, Vice-President, University Development, University of Waterloo.

4. *Subcommittee on Operating Grants*

Task: To study matters pertaining to the Provincial Government operating grants system and to make recommendations on these matters to the Committee of Presidents; to maintain liaison with the relevant subcommittee of the Committee on University Affairs; to undertake such other related tasks as may be assigned to it by the Committee of Presidents.

Membership: Five members including at least one from a large university, one from a university of intermediate size, and one from a small university.

Chairman: Mr. B. L. Hansen, Director, Office of Institutional Research, University of Toronto.

5. *Subcommittee on Capital Financing*

Task: To study the problems presented by the planning, construction and financing of university buildings, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Committee of Presidents; to maintain liaison with the organization of campus planners and physical plant administrators of Ontario universities; to maintain liaison with appropriate officials of the Department of University Affairs.

Membership: About half-a-dozen persons representing large and small universities and the administrative functions of campus planning and campus financing.

Chairman: Mr. D. M. Hedden, Vice-President (Administration), McMaster University.

6. *Subcommittee on Student Aid*

Task: To study the problems relating to the provision and administration of financial aid to university students in Ontario, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Committee of Presidents; to maintain liaison with appropriate officials of the Department of University Affairs.

Membership: About seven or eight persons – some experienced in the formation of policy for, and some in the administration of, university student aid programmes.

Chairman: Mr. Robin Ross, Vice-President and Registrar, University of Toronto.

7. *Subcommittee on Public Relations*

Task: To suggest to the Committee of Presidents ways in which the nature, the roles, the problems and the actions of the universities can be interpreted to the public; to advise the Committee on relations with the press and other media of communication; and, as requested by the Committee of Presidents from time to time, to arrange for news releases.

Membership: Seven or eight persons, including a preponderance of university information or public relations officers, but also representatives of general university administration and of persons oriented primarily towards the philosophy and politics of higher education.

Chairman: Dr. J. G. Hagey, President, University of Waterloo.

8. *Subcommittee on Computer Services*

Task: To study and make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents on problems related to the development, coordination and financing of university computing services in Ontario; to provide representation of the Committee of Presidents for joint discussions with representatives of the Committee on University Affairs of these problems as opportunities are presented; to examine appropriate relations with institutions and agencies both inside and outside the Province of Ontario with respect to computer services.

Membership: a representative of each of the Ontario universities with computer needs or installations, with power to add.

Chairman: Dr. C. C. Gotlieb, Director, Institute of Computer Science, University of Toronto.

9. *Subcommittee on Teacher Education*

Task: To study the implications for the universities of Ontario of the education and training of teachers by the universities, including the recommendations contained in the *Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, 1966*; to make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents regarding policy and procedure to be followed in establishing new programmes of teacher education in the universities of Ontario; to act as a continuing advisory committee to the universities in the development of these programmes.

Membership: at least one representative from each interested university in the Province. Universities with colleges or faculties of education may be represented by two persons – one from the college or faculty of education and the other from the faculty of arts or arts and science.

Chairman: Dr. J. A. Gibson, President, Brock University.

10. *Subcommittee on Student Housing*

Task: (*a*) Generally, to study problems in the provision and operation of student residences and make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents; (*b*) more particularly, to establish space/cost standards and area factors, and to determine to what extent the construction of student housing requires subsidization; (*c*) to give direction to the study and consideration of the various possible methods of contracting for residence design and construction which might prove to be economical and acceptable to the universities; (*d*) to maintain liaison with other appropriate subcommittees of the Committee of Presidents, notably the Subcommittee on Capital Financing, and with appropriate representatives of the Committee on University Affairs and the Ontario Student Housing Corporation; (*e*) to present an interim report on items (*b*) and (*c*) to the Committee of Presidents at the earliest possible time.

Membership: Six to eight persons representing a variety of interests in student housing, including at least one from a large university, one from a university of intermediate size, one from a small university, and one student member.

Chairman: Professor D. F. Forster, Vice-Provost and Executive Assistant to the President, University of Toronto.

11. *Special Subcommittee on Assessment of Library Requirements*

Task: To seek to determine standards by which to assess the needs and deficiencies of the libraries of provincially assisted universities in Ontario, with special reference to undergraduate collections.

Membership: Three university librarians (one to be Chairman, one from a smaller university, and one familiar with French-language libraries); three academics (one from the humanities, one from the social sciences, and one from the natural sciences); two systems analysts (one expert in library

systems and one in systems analysis generally); the chairmen of the Ontario Council of University Librarians and of the Subcommittee on Operating Grants (*ex officio*).

Chairman: Mr. W. B. Ready, University Librarian and Professor of Bibliography, McMaster University.

12. *Special Subcommittee on Assessment of Graduate and Research Library Requirements*

Task: (*a*) To establish a method of assessing the extent to which Ontario university libraries are adequate to support existing and proposed programmes of graduate study and research, including faculty research where there is no graduate programme; (*b*) to establish a method of estimating all related costs; and (*c*) as methods are developed and approved, to proceed to their application.

Membership: Ten members: five university librarians and five academics (including graduate deans) representing the humanities, the social sciences and the natural sciences.

Chairman: Dr. R. H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian, University of Toronto.

13. *Ontario College Health Association* (subcommittee)

Task: "To develop and pursue all measures which may optimally initiate, preserve, unify, and promote the health of our students and college communities by providing a forum for the exchange of information and the personal sharing of experiences."

Membership: (*a*) Institutional—institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario. (*b*) Individual—persons working within or responsible for the establishment of health services in such institutions. (*c*) Associate—persons working in allied fields and disciplines but not actually within established health services.

President: Dr. D. H. Upton, Director of Psychological Services (and Co-ordinator of Counselling), University of Guelph.

14. *Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions* (affiliate)

Task: To deal with all admissions questions (both policy and procedures) of joint concern to the Ontario universities and specifically to make recommendations with respect to an Ontario Universities' Applications Centre.

Membership: At least one member from each university and not more than three from multi-faculty institutions, selection of the members to be the responsibility of the individual university.

Chairman: Dr. F. A. DeMarco, Vice-President, University of Windsor.

15. *Ontario Council on Graduate Studies* (affiliate)

Task: To promote the advancement of graduate education and research in the provincially assisted universities in Ontario; to consider matters referred to it by the Committee of Presidents; to advise the Committee of Presidents on the planning and development of an orderly pattern of graduate education and research, having regard, among other things, to the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of programmes and facilities.

Membership: The provincially assisted universities of Ontario, each represented by the Dean of Graduate Studies or the Chairman of the Committee on Graduate Studies.

Chairman: Dr. Ernest Sirluck, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Toronto.

16. *Ontario Council of University Librarians* (affiliate)

Task: To oversee standards of general library service in the universities; to supervise the management of any such bibliographic centre and system of reader services as may result from the further recommendations of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Ontario Council of University Librarians; to cooperate with other agencies and councils as appropriate; to advise the Committee of Presidents on these matters.

Membership: The chief librarians of the provincially assisted universities, with power to add associate members or consultants as occasion requires.

Chairman: Mr. W. F. Dollar, Librarian, University of Windsor.

17. *Advisory Joint Council on Coordination of Ontario University Library Research Facilities* (affiliate)

Task: (*a*) to advise the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario on matters of policy and budget relating to the coordination of university library research facilities; (*b*) to ensure the discharge of responsibilities assumed by institutions in accepting the allocation of special areas of research development, and of duties with respect to the bibliographic centre and special reader services; (*c*) to advise the Ontario Council of University Librarians on the operation of the Bibliographic Centre and special reader services; (*d*) to advise the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies on the operation of appraisal procedures as they affect libraries.

Membership: The membership of the Advisory Joint Council shall consist of all members of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Ontario Council of University Librarians.

Chairman: Mrs. Doris E. Lewis, Librarian, University of Waterloo.

18. *Ontario Universities' Television Council* (affiliate)

Task: On request, to advise and assist universities, and to make recommendations to universities or to the Province, or both, on the development and use of television teaching in Ontario universities.

Membership: One academic representative from each provincially assisted university in Ontario.

Chairman: Professor W. J. McCallion, Director of Educational Services and Extension, McMaster University.

19. *Ontario Council of Deans of Medicine* (affiliate)

Task: To provide an effective means of coordination of effort and a regular medium of communication between the faculties of medicine of universities of Ontario, having regard to the need to avoid unnecessary duplication or overlap of programmes between individual faculties and to provide special interuniversity projects which relate to medical education, research, and health services; to advise the Committee of Presidents of

Universities of Ontario on matters which will influence medical education and research and to consider such matters as are referred to it by the Committee of Presidents; to serve as liaison between the faculties of medicine and government agencies concerned with health and hospital services, professional colleges and associations, and any other organizations the activities of which influence medical education and research.

Membership: Each Ontario university with a faculty of medicine represented by the Dean of Medicine, with power to add the vice-presidents of health science and other associate members as occasion requires.

Chairman: Dr. E. H. Botterell, Vice-President, Health Sciences, and Dean of Medicine, Queen's University.

20. *Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering* (affiliate)

Task: To provide a medium of communication among the engineering faculties of Ontario so that engineering education in the Province may evolve optimally; to advise the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario on any appropriate aspect of education.

Membership: Deans of engineering of faculties conferring the baccalaureate degree at institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario whose presidents are members of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

Chairman: Dr. J. M. Ham, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, University of Toronto.

21. *Association of Student Awards Officers of the Universities of Ontario* (affiliate)

Task: To provide a forum for the discussion of matters relating to student financial assistance programmes; to encourage and conduct studies on matters relating thereto; to advise the Committee of Presidents through the Subcommittee on Student Aid on these matters; to cooperate with other agencies and councils as appropriate; to promote training of student awards staff; to represent the student awards officers of the Association in Canada and internationally and to seek and maintain active liaison with other groups having similar interests and objectives.

Membership: Student awards officers of the provincially assisted universities. Membership may be extended to the student awards officers of other post-secondary institutions in Ontario.

Chairman: Mr. E. E. Mitchelson, Secretary-Treasurer, Board of Governors, Brock University.

22. *Ontario Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools* (affiliate)

Task: To promote closer relations among individuals and institutions interested in credit and non-credit university extension and to work for the development and improvement of continuing education at the university level.

Membership: Deans, directors and associate or assistant deans or directors of extension of degree-granting universities whose presidents are members of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

Chairman: Reverend E. C. Pappert, Director of Extension, University of Windsor.

23. *Ontario University Registrars' Association* (affiliate)

Task: (*a*) To provide an effective means to coordinate effort and a medium of communication among members of the Association; (*b*) to concern itself with items of academic administration, including admissions, registration, examinations, scheduling, transcripts, records, calendars, scholarships and awards, and secondary school liaison; (*c*) to encourage and conduct studies of matters related to (*b*); (*d*) to conduct seminars for the exchange of information and development of new procedures.

Membership: Administrative officers of Ontario universities responsible for the areas of (*b*) above.

President: Mr. M. A. Bider, Director of Admissions and Records, York University.

24. *Ontario Committee of Deans and Directors of Library Schools* (affiliate)

Task: (*a*) To provide a medium of communication among the library schools of Ontario; (*b*) to promote the development and foster the improvement of education for librarianship in Ontario; and (*c*) to advise the Committee of Presidents on any appropriate aspect of library education.

Membership: Deans and directors of library schools of universities whose presidents are members of the Committee of Presidents.

Chairman: Professor R. Brian Land, Director, School of Library Science, University of Toronto.

Appendix D

GENERAL MEETING OF DISCIPLINE GROUPS, MAY 11, 1968

OPENING ADDRESS BY DR. J. A. CORRY

On behalf of the Committee of Presidents, I welcome this distinguished company. I thank you for coming at the week-end, many of you from a long distance, to take part in this meeting. I justify asking you to come by saying that the business before us today is vitally important; indeed, I think it to be the most important business the universities of Ontario have yet attempted together.

We have known for some time that the days of laissez-faire in university education in Ontario are over. We have accepted this with good grace and have set about building a voluntary system in which we submit our graduate programmes to outside appraisal; share our library resources and welcome visiting scholars from other universities within the system. We have adopted a common admission procedure and welcomed a uniform formula for operating grants. We are now cooperating in the search for a capital formula and are on the point of endorsing a systems approach to the sharing of computer facilities. In only one area—the coordination of graduate studies—have we shrunk from grasping the nettle and weeding out any unnecessary and costly duplication, actual or potential, in graduate programmes. Today we have come here to grasp the nettle and clear the ground for a rational distribution of well-planned graduate programmes.

The urgent reasons for cooperation in the field of graduate studies are not far to seek. An obvious one is that if the universities don't get together and do the job themselves the Government will step in and do it for them. The Minister of University Affairs alluded to this possibility in his Frank Gerstein lecture in February 1966, when he said that if the universities of Ontario failed to meet the responsibilities of the times, and "if costly duplication of effort is evident, I cannot imagine that any society, especially one bearing large expense for higher education, will want to stand idly by. For there will be inevitably a demand—there have been indications of this in other jurisdictions—that governments move in and take over."[1] I do not regard this statement as a threat to university autonomy. Rather, I take it as an expression of the inevitable consequence of our failure to order our affairs in a reasonable way. I do not say that we have yet failed. I do say we have not got as far forward as we should.

[1]William G. Davis, "The Government of Ontario and the Universities of the Province," *Governments and the University* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1966), p. 34.

The financial constraints now facing the universities of Ontario push us strongly to cooperation in the expensive area of graduate studies. These constraints may not be unrelated to an impression in government circles that we have not done enough to put our houses in order. Anyway, there is growing evidence that the Government of Ontario, even with goodwill towards the university and an announced intention to give the highest priority to education, is not going to find it politically feasible to give the universities all the money they consider necessary for their development as institutions which are to be at once first class, and equipped to do all that is attractive to them and worthwhile doing for its own sake. Some of us may think that the Government is pursuing a short-sighted policy and is failing to realize that sums invested in the universities today will pay handsome dividends in accelerated economic growth in the future, that higher education is the best kind of investment open to us, and that the most important factor of production is brains. But the Government has to face the electorate every four or five years and must, in the nature of the democratic process, balance long-term benefits against immediate burdens. To be blunt about it, the universities, taken individually, will never have enough for all good purposes and so will be operating in conditions of scarcity. We must, therefore, accept the hard consequences of scarcity, submit to the dictates of the "dismal science," and learn how to make the maximum use of our scarce resources.

As I have just said, I do not think the universities of Ontario will have the means to continue developing as first class institutions while at the same time pursuing a policy of self-sufficiency in which each counts on doing all that is attractive and well worth doing. So we face a choice. We can spread our scarce resources thinly in an effort at complete institutional independence of action while we sink down to second or third class status; or, on the other hand, we can aim at maintaining quality at the sacrifice of part of our self-sufficiency and some of our ambitions. Surely we must choose the latter course because no university worthy of the name would choose with its eyes open to be less than first class in what it offers. I do not think this latter alternative is as harsh as we fear. In Ontario, it is still open to each of us, in giving up some of our individual independence of action, to surrender it to the university system consisting of, and guided by, the universities themselves. It is greatly to the credit of the Government of Ontario that this is the course it would prefer us to take.

I wish I could say that the process of cooperation in the field of graduate studies will be a painless one, but I would be less than frank if I pretended that this was so. All the universities will have to pass self-denying ordinances and curb their aspirations in some directions. The older and more mature universities can take comfort that by and large cooperation will not require them to give up programmes of graduate studies already flourishing. Yet it will not do for them to say grimly, "Whatever we have we hold." They will have to remember that cooperation and coordination cannot be wholly at the expense of the newer and the smaller. To prevent that, the older and more mature will have to consider retraction in some fields of minimal commitment. If voluntary coordination is to work there will have to be some sacrificing of interests and ambitions all around.

In the past, through lack of resources, Ontario universities perforce lagged in graduate studies, had to fill gaps in our needs for university teachers and research people by attracting both Canadians and immigrants who had got graduate degrees abroad. Over the past decade the position has changed. Graduate programmes have been multiplied and extended in Ontario universities, and we are now well on the way to closing the gaps. Fortunately, as I said, there is little evidence that unnecessary duplication has yet reached alarming dimensions.

I hasten to say that, short of concentrating all graduate study in one huge graduate school in the province, there is no escape from some duplication in many fields of study. Economics, history, chemistry, physics are good illustrations. In the more esoteric fields we probably ought to avoid all duplication. But what fields are esoteric in this degree will call for nice judgments. In between these two extremes there will also be fairly exquisite issues as to when duplication is unnecessary, because the decision will have to turn on future requirements as well as on present circumstances.

Our main task, however, will be not one of cutting back what already exists but of planning and coordinating future developments. Rapid as has been the growth of our graduate schools in recent years, most of their ordering and development is ahead of us. This year there are just under 9,000 full-time graduate students in the universities of Ontario. If the momentum we have now reached is continued, that number will more than double by 1975 and may triple by 1981.

Of course I do not know, nor do I think anyone else can carry conviction right now in saying, that we shall or shall not find such numbers of well qualified persons seeking graduate education. It is perhaps also problematical whether we will need such numbers of persons with postgraduate degrees. We do know we have been competing with one another pretty sharply in the last few years for the limited number of well qualified Canadian graduate students and have been taking significant numbers of non-Canadians to fill up available places. So the estimate of numbers of graduate students in 1975 and 1981 is somewhat speculative.

Planning and coordination will not come easily to us. It is a commonplace that our domestic academic tradition has been highly individualistic. Both exhortation and example from highly respectable quarters have sold us on private enterprise. As Kenneth Hare said in the first of his three Plaunt Lectures a year ago:

> I remember a picture, I think in the *New Yorker*, of the U.N. headquarters in New York with all the flags of the nations flying one way, except for one lonely flag pointing the other way. It was the flag of the Soviet Union, but it might well have been that of Academe. We resist uniformity, change, external control, organization. We are not organization men, but cave-dwellers. And we are by nature competitive as societies, even tribal in characteristics. The mere thought that common action by our tribes in confederacy, like that of the Iroquois, might strengthen our hand, leaves us disdainful. Many of us will publicly deny this, but mentally admit it.[2]

[2]Kenneth Hare, *On University Freedom in the Canadian Context* (University of Toronto Press in association with Carleton University, 1968), p. 22.

I quoted earlier the Minister of University Affairs as telling us, in effect, that if the universities don't do the job the government will do it for us. Now I should like to quote another passage from his Gerstein Lecture in 1966:

> But I am sure that to a very great extent the solution must lie in cooperation and coordination; in a willingness on the part of one university to share its facilities and, indeed, its staff, with students of another; in a willingness, as I have already noted, to share library facilities and materials; in a willingness, perhaps, to defer the entry into graduate work in given disciplines until such time as the over-all demand would indicate that such expansion is required.[3]

This then is the task that confronts us. In taking up this task of cooperation in graduate studies, Ontario will not be breaking entirely fresh ground. In 1962, eight universities in the Atlantic Provinces initiated the Atlantic Provinces Inter-University Committee on the Sciences with the object of concerting their efforts in the expensive scientific field. Some of the universities have decided to specialize in a B.Sc. or an honours B.Sc. programme, while others will offer a programme at the master's level. Graduate work in the sciences, particularly at the doctoral and postdoctoral level, is concentrated on Dalhousie University in its Faculty of Graduate Studies and in engineering at the Nova Scotia Technical College.

In the United States the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, representing eleven Midwestern universities, was formed in 1958. The CIC operates a number of cooperative programmes, for example a programme in bio-meteorology conducted on a resource-sharing basis. Under the current programme students simply move from one campus to another taking courses or using laboratories and field facilities in which particular institutions have special strength. Another CIC initiative is a graduate-level programme of summer institutes in comparative literature designed to provide a strong pooling of resources and to open new research avenues for scholars in the field.

There are examples in the United States not only of cooperation among equals but also of smaller institutions which have established graduate programmes jointly with large universities nearby. Augustana College, Illinois, is offering a master's degree in earth science jointly with Iowa State University. Many colleges offer a three-year pre-engineering course in cooperation with a university graduate school. Princeton's special programme in Critical Languages allows students from colleges to transfer to its campus for a year. The University of Chicago offers a master's degree in one year through coordination of its programme with over twenty liberal arts colleges.

To the smaller universities in Ontario, which may be apprehensive that cooperation will tend to make them mere appendages of larger institutions, American experience shows that it is not always the big institution that possesses the distinctive programme or the prized facility. It is said that the finest telescope in the State of Missouri is located on the campus of Central Methodist College and its larger neighbours need not duplicate this expensive instrument.

All the examples of cooperation that I have cited are from voluntary

[3]William G. Davis, *op. cit*, p. 42.

systems. There are, of course, many instances of coordination at the graduate level within the state university systems of New York, Illinois, California, etc. But since in Ontario we aspire to effective voluntary cooperation, I have omitted examples of coordination within the state systems. We would be wrong, however, to ignore the achievements of these systems, and we might do much worse than aim to match what the best of them have accomplished in "quality, efficiency and aggressiveness" by voluntary means—while at the same time avoiding their obvious mistakes. As we try to think ingeniously and imaginatively about solutions, we should look carefully at the state university systems in the United States.

Up to now in my remarks, I have stressed the need for cooperation, expressed a preference for doing it voluntarily and cited examples to show that it can be done. But I should be most remiss if I left you with the impression that there is nothing here but bitter pills to swallow. Cooperation and coordination have marked positive advantages. I have left them until now because I thought it better to offer a bracing chaser than to try to sugar-coat the pills themselves.

First, working together may enable us to do things that each of us working alone could not bring off. If one man has two left shoes and another man has two right shoes of the same size, design and colour as the first man's, each by himself will be a cripple; together, they can both run and not be wearied. To use an even more fitting example: if two neighbouring universities are both aspiring to graduate work in political science and in economics but neither has quite enough strength in either area to offer a programme at the graduate level, graduate work will have to be postponed at both places. But if they can work cooperatively, their strengths may complement each other. By pooling their resources, one may be able to offer a graduate programme in political science while the other undertakes graduate work in economics.

Here, then are two programmes where none would otherwise have existed. Of course, this solution will not delight the two departments that are disappointed in their plans, even though these were essentially unrealizable. But they can take comfort from the fact that demand is growing and will continue to grow. Perhaps in the future, there would be graduate programmes in both fields in both universities, unless, of course, all were swallowed up in the interval by behavioural psychology!

Cooperation may provide a small university with its only real chance of developing distinctive centres of excellence. Such an institution existing in the shadow of big neighbours may in circumstances of unrestricted competition find itself shut out of all the fields in which it might astutely equip itself to excel. The hard fact, of course, is that when new or developing fields are up for grabs, the older and larger universities can almost always take the risks of an initiative more quickly than can the newer and smaller. If, on the other hand, there is cooperation and big neighbours make some self-denying ordinances, as they must if voluntary coordination is to work, the smaller institutions can hope to gain by some fresh thinking about new and exciting departures, and so be able to develop as *the* centre in particular fields in its region, if not in the whole Province.

The Committee of Presidents has not evolved a blueprint for cooperation

for me suddenly to produce for your endorsement. It is the Committee's hope that the initiative will flow from the disciplines themselves and that the patterns of cooperation to be pricked out will be those you judge most likely to be fruitful, conducive to the preservation and development of excellence, in the context of the opportunities, as well as the constraints, facing the universities. However, the Committee did invite the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies to suggest ways in which cooperation might be achieved. The Council did so, and I now offer some of its suggestions in the belief that you will want to explore them along with the other ideas coming out of your discussion.

The Council on Graduate Studies thought that a brief from each of the disciplines outlining the special character of the discipline, indicating the necessary core areas and the optional areas of specialization within it, would be helpful in planning. Each discipline might also indicate potential or realized areas of excellence in highly specialized fields of concentration for which special and expensive equipment or special library collections would be necessary. The information so gathered could be summarized in an inventory showing graduate programmes in being; those that have been approved and budgeted for; and programmes now in the planning stage which have not yet been approved.

The second suggestion of the Council on Graduate Studies was that the reaction of the disciplines should be sought to the possibility of organizing summer institutes in a region. Each participating university would concentrate on courses in a limited number of disciplines—e.g., one university would offer graduate courses in one or two fields of science while another offered programmes in one or two fields in the humanities. Universities could, if they wished, alternate between their offerings in the field of science, the social sciences and the humanities, or in a combination of fields.

You will no doubt want to discuss the feasibility of opening a limited number of graduate courses in one university in a region to graduate students registered in another nearby institution. This is the third suggestion put forward by the Council on Graduate Studies.

If the cooperative ventures envisaged in the second and third suggestions of the Graduate Deans were implemented it would be necessary to give careful consideration to an equitable means of sharing costs—whether by transfer of fees, sharing basic income units, straight payments, clearing-house calculations or some other method.

Perhaps the fourth suggestion of the Council of Graduate Studies is the one of which we can most wholeheartedly approve. The Council suggested that the disciplines should be invited to discover any undeveloped areas of graduate studies and research which ought to be taken up in the Province. It is, as I have said, the hope of the Committee of Presidents that inter-university cooperation within disciplines will enable us to do together what we cannot do alone. If it were found that no university in the Province was offering a graduate programme in some significant field and the discipline representatives thought there ought to be such a programme, they could recommend its establishment at an appropriate and willing university and suggest the administrative and financial arrangements needed to enable other universities to share in the programme.

Interuniversity cooperation at the graduate level is necessary if we are to make optimum use of scarce resources. It has been shown to be feasible in other jurisdictions and we are encouraged to believe that it will be feasible in Ontario by the favourable developments in and continuing prospects of cooperation in appraisals, the sharing of library research materials and computer facilities and other cooperative ventures on which we are already embarked.

Substantial progress along these lines at the graduate level will also, I think, be liberating for us all because our case for support in operating and capital grants will be so much the better. The vital concern of the whole community with continuing advance in higher education is understood in government circles and by many in the wider community. The advance will continue if we can give a good account of our stewardship.